TO: Members of the Board of Trustees
FROM: Dr. Francisco Rodriguez, Chancellor
DATE: August 3, 2016

SUBJECT: BOARD LETTER FOR AUGUST 10, 2016 MEETING

Board Meeting Location
Next week’s Board meeting will be held at the Educational Services Center. The meeting times and locations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convene for First Public Session</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Board Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess to First Closed Session</td>
<td>Immediately Following First Public Session</td>
<td>Hearing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene for Second Public Session</td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Board Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene for Second Closed Session (if necessary)</td>
<td>Immediately Following Second Public Session</td>
<td>Hearing Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in this letter is explanatory information related to agenda items:

- There will be a meeting of the Committee of the Whole. The topic for discussion will be:
  - Update on Food Services
    Enclosed for your review is a timeline regarding steps taken to assess and provide food services. *(See Attachment A)*

- Under the Chancellor’s Report, there will be an:
  - Annual Update on the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee

- Enclosed for your review is background information regarding CH5: Approve West Los Angeles College Revised Mission Statement, which will be presented for Board approval at the August 10th Board meeting *(Refer to Attachment B)*
Enclosed for your review is a memo from John P. Dacey Esq., Lead Construction Counsel, regarding agenda item FPD1, VIII. A.: Ratify Amendment No. 11 to Design-Build Agreement No. 33801 with Harper Construction Company, which will be presented for Board approval at the August 10th Board meeting. *(Refer to Attachment C)*

**Other Matters**
Deputy Chancellors – Enclosed for your information is the monthly report by Steve Kish, SIS Project Monitor. This report is usually presented during the monthly meeting of the Budget & Finance Committee. *(Refer to Attachment D)*

**Confidential Matters**
The attached correspondence is confidential and should not be shared with other persons.

- **Office of General Counsel**
  - Enclosed for your review is the Bond-related litigation report. *(Refer to Attachment E)*
  - Enclosed for your review is the District-related litigation report. *(Refer to Attachment F)*
  - Enclosed for your review is background information regarding litigation: Vivian Henry v. LACCD. *(Refer to Attachment G)*
  - Enclosed for your review is an update report pertaining to complaints of discrimination/harassment. *(Refer to Attachment H)*
  - Enclosed for your review is an update report pertaining to the status on personnel actions. *(Refer to Attachment I)*

- **Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion** – Enclosed for your review is information regarding an Appeal of a Letter of Determination. *(Refer to Attachment J)*

- **Human Resources** – Enclosed for your review is information pertaining to disciplinary matters. *(Refer to Attachment K)*

*Please note that due to the size of the documents, the following attachments will be sent to you via Courier Super Delivery:*

ATTACHMENT A
ATTACHMENT J
ATTACHMENT K

Let me know should you have any questions regarding next week’s meeting.
TIMELINE ON FOOD SERVICES FOR LACCD

- In 2006, a food services consulting firm, Duffy Wilkie Group, was commissioned by the District. Due to college specific need, conditions and construction scheduling, the District elected a college by college approach.

- As part of identified bond projects, design and construction plans began for three, new working kitchens/teaching labs for Culinary Arts Programs at Harbor, Mission and Trade-Technical colleges and for Dining/Food Court kitchens and dining areas at the other six colleges.

- In 2008, Requests for Proposals (RFP) for a food court developer and operator under a joint occupancy lease concept was issued Pierce, Southwest and West Los Angeles colleges.

- These RFPs resulted in two responses received on the Pierce RFP and one each for West and Southwest colleges.

- In 2009, due to the economic recession, the selected respondent for both Pierce and West withdrew its proposals from each college.

- Southwest decided to postpone its food court plans until such time as it could determine a concept that would gain more interest from potential operators.

- In 2010, the District pursued discussions with USC Hospitality Services to develop a partnership in which USC would lease and provide food service to interested colleges. USC withdrew from discussions in March 2011.

- In May 2011, West issued a second RFP and received two responses, Denny’s and Lovebirds Café. Lovebirds was issued a lease for West on March of 2012.

- The Café West grand opening took place on April 19, 2012. West’s Lovebirds contract was cancelled in March 2015.

- In August of 2012, a multi-campus college food services RFP including Pierce, City, Southwest and East Los Angeles colleges was issued where bidders could propose to manage 1 or up to all four college food services. There were only two bidders and not all colleges received a bid. The bid process was terminated after colleges evaluated the responses and elected not to proceed.

- LA Pierce newly constructed Library/Learning Crossroads which included the five-station Food Court was completed in spring 2013.

- LA Pierce College selected Lovebirds to run one station in its Food Court in fall 2013. The lease was issued for grand opening January 15, 2014. This contract was not renewed when it expired in June 2015.

- The Board of Trustees Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMPOC) was provided a presentation on October 23, 2013 on the District’s attempts to establish a districtwide food services program.
• The Board committee members voted unanimously to hire an expert to determine the basic minimum food program standards district-wide and to prepare an assessment of each college's facilities.

• The first phase of the Food Program Assessment (Facilities set-up and operations) was completed and presented at the May 28, 2014 Board’s FMPOC meeting. The next phase was to receive input from students and staff/faculty.

• The Board of Trustees continued to receive comments and complaints about the lack of food services at the colleges, particularly that the first phase of the assessment had not included input from faculty, staff and students.

• In response, a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for a food services consultant to conduct focus groups and surveys at all colleges was issued in spring 2015.

• The Steering Committee, which rated the three proposals received, was composed of representatives from all the unions, classified management, vice presidents for administrative services and the student trustee. A firm was selected to conduct focus groups in the fall of 2015.

• An online survey was developed to be sent to faculty, staff and students as part of this process and was administered during a three week period. The survey served as information to be followed upon during focus groups conducted at the colleges.

• Additional information was collected from other multi-college districts (Maricopa, Miami-Dade and Cuyahoga Community College Districts), including a visit to the San Diego Community College District.

• Two focus groups per college were held, one for faculty and staff and the second for students. The analysis of the data from the online survey and focus groups was prepared.

• The results of the information gathering through the physical facilities food program assessment and the online survey and focus groups have guided the current process.

• In determining next steps, District administrators decided on a two-step approach to develop an RFQ first and then an RFP.

• The RFQ is meant to determine the history and experience of potential bidders financially as well as in providing high-volume food services to meet the unique needs for the six colleges that do not have a Culinary Arts program.

• Four colleges (East, Pierce, Valley and Wes) have well-built food court/dining areas (front of the house and kitchen/cooking/food preparation). Two colleges have no kitchen/cooking/food preparation facilities.

• While the two-phased methodology for the provision of food services district wide is taking place, colleges have entered into short-term contracts with vendors providing food trucks and dining services or a combination of these.
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Update on Food Services

August 10, 2016
Several Studies Have Been Conducted
- Duffy Wilkie Group, 2006
- Food Program Assessment, 2013
- Opinion Research, 2015

Options Explored
- Food Court:
  - Los Angeles Pierce College
  - Los Angeles Southwest College
  - West Los Angeles College
- Partnership with USC
- Single college contracts
- Multi-college request for proposals

Current Status of Food Services
- Culinary Arts Programs-Harbor, Mission, Trade Tech
- Food trucks/mobile solutions
  - City, East, Harbor, Pierce, Southwest, West
- Grab & go, hot & cold food
  - City, East, Harbor, Mission, Pierce, Southwest, Valley, West
- Vending at all locations
- Coffee shops
  - City, Pierce, Valley, West
- Dining/food court/hot food
  - Pierce, Valley, West
Food Program Assessment of Physical Facilities

- Food program assessment of physical facilities
- Two colleges (City and Southwest) require build out of the facilities
- East and West—each has small cooking preparation with dining areas
- Pierce and Valley—each has food court/dining

Most Recent Assessment—focus on Preferences

- Online survey: 12,440 student responses and 2,168 faculty and staff responses
- Focus groups: two per college; one for students and one for faculty and staff

Opinion Research Showed

- Lack of healthy food choices impacts students’ health, concentration and academic performance
- Lack of food options signify a lack of concern for students and their needs
- Lack of communal dining areas hinders ability to build a sense of community and detracts from student life
These Findings Can Be Interpreted as:
- Most respondents indicated the source of their dissatisfaction:
  - Lack of variety
  - Lack of healthy, fresh options
  - Long wait times & lines
  - Lack of dining area

Opportunities for Service
- Faculty, staff, and students across nine colleges asked for:
  - Greater variety
  - Healthy, fresh food
  - Hot, made-to-order options
  - Grab-and-go options
  - A cafeteria or food court with communal dining area
  - Service at night
  - Brand-type food, like Panda Express or Chipotle, but not necessarily the specific branded restaurant

Opportunities for Improvement
- Contract using a mix of national and local brands
- Create opportunities for student jobs/internships
- Use a single software system for Point of Sale
- Establish safety standards for all colleges
- Complete state-of-the-art build-out of food service facilities
Recommendations From Food Program Assessment

- Continue as is
- Hire a Food Program Specialist
- Contract with a single source food provider

Rationale for Single Source Food Provider

- Can tailor food programs to meet individual college needs from diverse cuisines
- Safety standards can be adhered among colleges
- Can provide the investment needed to support colleges where facilities are not built out yet
- Pricing can be consistent among colleges and within a single college campus

Options Available Going Forward

- Piggyback UC's and CSU's food services agreements
- Multiple short-term lease agreements with multiple vendors
- Food services agreement RFP
- Joint occupancy lease RFP
Next Steps--1

• Determine solution for Request for Proposals:
  o Single, district-wide vendor for food services
to include mobile, Grab & Go, hot food
  preparation and vending
  
  o Multiple vendors serving one or more
colleges with same services

Next Steps--2

• Proposed Timeline
  -- RFC process is in development
  -- Advertised, August-September
  -- Pool established, October
  -- RFP to be developed, August-October
  -- Advertised, October-November
  -- Proposals due January, 2017
  -- Contract award(s), March, 2017
  -- Services to begin, start of fall 2017 semester

Questions?
Los Angeles Community College District Food Program Assessment

February 26, 2014
Jerry Thoener
Food Program Consultant
Attached is the comprehensive report for your review that concludes with a series of recommendations for LACCD to consider for the future success of their food services.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LACCD, a nine college district in the heart of Los Angeles County, is seeking a food service program for the entire District that will satisfy the College needs, improve the use of current and future space, provide enhanced food services to its students and staff, and financially operate in a position that moves the effectiveness of its operation to a future profit.

Opportunity
Los Angeles Community College District is currently looking for ways to improve food offerings to the students, faculty and staff. Existing attempts to provide different food venues have proven to provide less than desirable results.

Solutions
This report reviewed several different options. As a result of this review it was determined that LACCD has an immense opportunity to choose a single outsourced Food Service Provider or a District Specialist for food services who can create a groundbreaking system that will enhance all of the Colleges’ food service offerings and uncover an unprecedented available market. No longer will the students and staff of LACCD have to wonder what the definition is of food service at their College.

Market Potential
Food services across the District, when improved and sales are tracked, have the distinct advantage of supplying a never-before performance record and the simple ability to develop financial forecasts.

Moving Forward
The District should move into the next phase of either 1) procurement of a Request for Proposal for a single outsourced Food Service Provider or 2) begin the search process for a District Food Service Specialist.

I look forward to meeting with you and discussing the report in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Jerry Throener
Food Program Consultant
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MISSION

After visiting all of the Colleges and talking to several key administrators, there is a common thread to their mission of providing Food Service at each College. Stated common goals are:

- Breakeven financially
- A quality service and product for students
- Fast service
- Students, faculty and staff want to eat there
- Food safety

OPTIONS

The LACCD has one of three choices in order to make a long term decision on the future for Food Service at their Colleges. The LACCD should be realistic here; their food service cannot be modeled after USC, UCLA or any other major institution, but LACCD should have a much better state of the art program than what is currently being offered at the colleges now: some with nothing and others having limited offerings. LACCD has three choices for the future:

1) Continue operating as silos at each college

Continue operating LACCD as it is now, with limited expertise at the College or District level, with no leveraging of purchasing agreements, using the District for all of the support functions, and enforcing no food safety standards nor monitoring of CalOSHA regulations. This choice continues low or no success with the desired mission and a good possibility of never breaking even. Marketing will be non-existent.

2) Hire a food service specialist to manage the food service from a district enterprise level

Hire a food service specialist in house which will continue to use the support functions of the district but will bring some standards to sanitation, CalOSHA, purchasing, consistent pricing, and food safety. The food service specialist would need experience in remodeling or building of anything new for food services. The specialist should be able to review drawings to make sure there is enough space allotted and that current utilities are sufficient for the concept or concepts being introduced for construction or utilization. Also this individual should have some knowledge of equipment and could review the excess equipment sitting dormant that could be transferred to help other colleges meet their needs throughout LACCD. The District needs to open a search for a qualified candidate and conduct a strong hiring process. This option will require office support to
help the specialist leader manage all operations. Marketing with this option is often initiated but
not sustained for a long period of time.

3) Outsource it all to a contracted single source Food Service provider

Outsource to a single Food Service provider, which creates relief from all of the support departments
within the District, since these functions will be performed by the Food Service providers’ support
team, either within the state or at the corporate office. The challenge will be creating a single contract
that will support all of the Colleges’ needs, but this can be done. The other big issue here will be the
required investment that is needed by each College (this will be addressed later in this report). The
Food Service provider will need all food service revenue for their success which will create some
challenge and disappointment for the bookstores, ASO and other organizations that are currently
getting funding from some type of food service revenue.

MARKETING

Marketing would be a huge plus for the District, since a Food Service provider understands its
importance and how to drive traffic to the locations. This is the basic foundation for the success of each
College dining program within the District, both for financial success and customer satisfaction. The
Food Service provider has the pulse of the trends within the state and nationally at all times. Also
available are their national brand partners, e.g., Burger King, Taco Bell, Subway, Blimpie’s, Starbucks,
Java City, Panda Express, Pizza Hut, Einstein’s, Papa John’s and many other national and regional
brands. The Food Service provider already has a master agreement with the brand so it is very easy to
install, if the match is determined. Sometimes the local franchisee in the area can block a brand from
being installed at a College, because they feel they will lose revenue themselves. A Food Service
provider can work this out and bring a list of national, regional, and local food concepts that will work
for each of the Colleges. The Food Service providers would recommend different concepts/brands to
the different colleges based, in part, on the ethnicity and taste of the customers. The Food Service
provider would know which brand would drive the foot traffic to the venue at the Colleges to best
maximize the revenues to be captured. Most of the national brands have their own set of specifications
for the layout, equipment, and utilities at a site. This requirement needs to all be part of the initial
discussion with the architects to make sure that this specific brand site will be built to their specs.

Today, at all locations, concepts are being built for general uses of undetermined/undefined concepts.
This assumption is a problem and becomes more expensive by having to make changes to the areas
that are needed for these national, regional or local brands; a cost that the Food Service provider,
College or the District will need to absorb. The sooner the proposed concepts are identified for each
new location; it will be somewhat easier to get the changes made but inevitably, with some additional
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costs. Most national, regional and even the local brands will ask for exclusivity of their products, a royalty fee, a marketing fee, and sometimes, a guaranteed revenue amount.

LABOR

The Food Service provider can hire at its discretion and pay the hourly wages to its own employees that are competitive in the marketplace. At some point, the local Union will approach the employees about joining a Union and the Food Service provider will conduct this discussion. The Food Service providers will want to hire students as much as possible to work 20 hours per week on site and still maintain a good, solid full-time work force. Every college has expressed the difficulty and concern regarding the food service positions that constitute short working weeks and not year round work, and therefore the challenge to attract and maintain a full-time staff. This is a valid concern but most Food Service providers will have other jobs for the full time employees during downtime and summers at some of their other venues, such as sports stadiums, other lines of business, and national parks. The students will also have a great opportunity to apply for those same jobs and internships, both paid and unpaid, a favorable combination to keep a great working staff. All the Food Service providers will offer some type of benefit package for full time employees.

CENTRAL TRACKING

LACCD has a great story to tell and needs to capitalize on how to tell the Food Service providers about this untold appeal. The big piece for the Food Service providers is to figure out what the revenue really is today and what it could be in the future, without any available historical data for them to review. The biggest untapped possibility is the one-card Financial Aid debit card that is not currently marketed well. It is important to keep in mind that these dollars are already being spent elsewhere. If this is marketed correctly and aggressively, there is an enormous chance for students to vote with their financial dollars; especially if speed of service is fast and the food tastes great, they will perceive a great value because revenue dollars will confirm their satisfaction. The Food Service providers can make this happen if it's done correctly. Another big expense to a designated cost center will be a centralized Point of Service (POS) system for the whole District so that the Food Service provider or LACCD specialist can maintain consistent pricing, perpetual inventory, and movement of products across all colleges. This system would provide the same advantage for the convenience stores (c-stores), vending and truck caterer, consistent pricing, which is not happening currently. Also the goal is to make sure that all POS registers can take credit/debit cards, which is not currently the case.

Auditing of the vending, catering trucks and carts, c-stores and what food services do exist, does not occur. With a single source Food Service provider, this would all be done due to the Food Service provider internal cash handling procedures. With this being said, the Food Service provider will make
certain that every outside vendor/supplier they use will have a lease or contract that meets the District agreement for the Food Service provider. In today's world a handshake is not acceptable as a contract due to the exposure of liability that there is in food service. For example the catering trucks should provide their license, the safety permits of the truck, and the food products served and their employee safety certificates.

STANDARDS

Food safety is becoming more and more a top priority for the Food Service providers, Colleges, and consumers. There are high industry standards that all food services must follow for the state of California, Los Angeles County and most likely, the city of Los Angeles. Usually once a month, a health inspector shows up unannounced and does an inspection, and that inspection is to be posted and food service is to fix any violations within so many days. Consequently, there is another inspection to follow up on the previous one to ensure understanding and compliance. Food labeling of products being stored is a must for all food services to comply with; for example, placing date received on the box or packaging; once opened, re-labeling with when to use by; storing of partial raw food items in the refrigerator must be labeled for what it is, who used it and when will it have to be used by; and the freezer has the same storage process as the refrigerator. All coolers and freezers must have a temperature log sheet for the day that is filled out twice a day; the same for temping food on the service line as to the serving temperature. These are only a few of the safety procedures.

STATE OF FOOD FACILITIES

The Food Service providers will take a much harder look at this opportunity if LACCD speaks of them as potential partners in this venture. Food Service partners then work together toward the same common goal of both parties. Due to the different degree of site completions at the different Colleges, the District will probably have to do some type of phased approach to the joint lease agreement. For example: Pierce could be up and running within three months once the punch list is complete, City College just has three shells of three walls and the utilities are in the ceiling needing DAS approval on any construction the Food Service provider has to do and could take 9-12 months; East College building has the steel frame up to accommodate a four concept food court and c-store, estimated to be finished in January 2015; West College has outsourced to Love Birds; Mission has a new culinary arts building with state-of-the-art equipment which clearly was overbuilt, with some sales reports, but a limited business approach to the finances. Valley College just tore down the old food service building, and the new one will not be ready for occupancy until August, 2015; plans are to have a food court with four concepts and a coffee shop. Southwest College has a new very small coffee shop in the newly remodeled Cox building to be completed by this August, 2014, and then in the distant future, space was committed in the School of Nursing, Math and Science building with an area of 550 sq. ft. allotted
for food service. It is anticipated that Trade Tech College will be constructing a new building for the Culinary and Bakery Arts Program in the near future; the current kitchen and serving area is well beyond the life expectancy of the equipment and facility. Harbor College has proposed a new site and building for the near future for their culinary arts program. The current space also has exceeded its life expectancy in the building and equipment. Obviously, the revenue will be coming in for the Food Service provider at different times over the next 3-5 years.

INVESTMENTS

Along with all of the different time frames for implementation are the different investment amounts needed by either the Food Service provider, College or the District. Inevitably, LACCD will be paying for these costs if not through direct up front expense then through amortization of the Food Service provider's funding. Each college has expectations for a Food Service provider to purchase operational supplies, including some higher expectations of larger equipment.

For example:

**City** – Food Service provider to pay for the complete build out of construction, equipment, small wares, pots & pans, and catering ware

**East** – Food Service provider to pay for all of the small wares, pots & pans, and catering wares

**Harbor** – Very little expense for the food service provider here to get started, since this is part of the educational teaching department

**Mission** – Very little expense to start up here, with some new signage, updates at the coffee/pastry concept in a classroom building

**Pierce** – Food Service provider to pay for all the small wares, pots & pans, catering ware, and signage

**Southwest** – Food Service provider to buy all of the small wares, pots & pans and catering ware

**Trade** – Very little expense for the Food Service provider here also, maybe updating serving lines, but also part of the educational budget

**Valley** – Food Service provider to build everything out with the equipment, utilities, pots & pans, small wares and catering wares

**West** – Food Service provider to help with another build out area to capture the students on the upper end toward the parking garage
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The District should make a decision on what can be amortized by the Food Service provider and what should be purchased by the District or College. The District/College should own the major pieces of equipment and maintain the repairs of them.

The District needs to make a decision that food service is a necessary service that needs to be provided and determine what level to provide. With this being said, then ALL of the revenue from food and beverage sales should be moved to the food service revenue accounts. Currently what is happening at all of the Colleges is that food and beverages being sold in the bookstores are helping the bookstores show a breakeven or a small profit. Ideally the bookstores could offer a few (15-20) items that we call impulse items for them to sell and keep the prices the same for all involved. From a Food Service provider’s point of view if the bookstore continues to sell more and more food and beverages, then the trade-off question is always can the food service sell items in their locations generally carried by the bookstores, since the food service areas are open longer hours?” Usually the answer is a very short “No.” Usually, putting the question in this perspective, results in a more reasonable solution.

TECHNOLOGY

Technology is an area where the Food Service provider can bring a huge support of expertise to the Colleges, with Point of Service (POS) systems, food production systems, payroll, accounts payable, sales reporting, food safety, purchasing, and training. The one element that will be needed for certain is a standardized POS system and for that system to be centralized for reporting, product movement, and Credit/Debit/Financial Aid cards to be taken at all of the POS locations as well as at a faster speed. The financial aid debit card (once it is marketed at the College) will drive foot traffic and expenditure averages upward, instead of the customer spending that money at other fast food restaurants off site. Food service experts will be very aggressive about this.

CATERING

Catering for special events at the Colleges has great potential that is currently not being captured other than a minimal amount at the Culinary Colleges. First of all, most of the Colleges do not have the facilities to produce the needs of catering. As the new buildings open with the kitchens to support the catering needs, then the Food Service provider or District specialist on college will want first right of refusal on any catering that is being done for the departments that can spend monies on food. Again, we do not know the amount of catering across all Colleges which could prove potentially huge for the Food Service provider to capture to help offset the downtimes and their fixed expenses. Additionally, providing the catering at the Educational Service Center itself should be considered depending on the types needed and the possible revenue lost.
SUMMER CAMP COORDINATION & ATHLETICS

Summer camps coordination and the Athletics Departments should be asked to build in a lunch program for all camps that are managed through the Colleges. This could be a simple bag lunch for all ages to a simple hot meal through the new dining areas. If there is a very large camp, the meals could be delivered to a location that could accommodate the size of the group. Athletic Departments should work with the food service provider on a cost plus agreement with them on items for their concession stands. Usually the Food Service provider will deliver items the day of an event or the items can be picked up all at once and even billed to the department, which normally cuts down on paper work and last minute retail shopping. The Food Service provider will need every dollar that the Colleges spend on food and beverages to flow through their accounts. This consistency will help them determine how much they can invest.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART/CHAIN OF COMMAND

The District will need to determine the reporting structure for the Food Service provider or District specialist. This reporting structure will be very important so that the nine Colleges all understand there is administrative support and expertise available for a food service resource for the Colleges to work with. This chain of command will help with consistency, pricing quality and future expansions. The food service person should be out and about visiting the Colleges to insure that the District’s goals are met. In the long run, a single source Food Service provider is the right way to go, due to the extensive resource of experts on its staff.

COST-SHARING

At virtually every college, the goal was to breakeven, and the Colleges want to move as many food service related costs to the Food Service provider as they possibly can. There needs to be some caution here; overburdening the Food Service provider is not the right win-win partnership for either the District or the Food Service provider. The District might consider a way to help the Food Service provider for the first 18-24 months, with no immediate additional expenses passed on from the individual Colleges. Once the food service provider has been supported to get established, then start moving some of those expenses to the Food Service provider, and eliminate those costs from the College budgets where they currently reside. The costs the District could be transferring are utilities, commissions, hood cleaning, trash expense, pest control, etc. The following chart shows what is typical for a Food Service provider to pay in direct costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Direct Expenses</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Food Service provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Bond</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood cleaning above screen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood cleaning to the screens</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire annul systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grease traps</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Removal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common area floor cleaning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of the house floor cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table tops in dining room</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet cleaning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>Depends on who owns it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment repair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of equipment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas and maintenances of vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper supplies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning supplies for food services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grease dumpster</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling bins</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General insurance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer repairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card fees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Promotions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small wares/China replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health exams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms/Laundry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training expense</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses/permits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation/Amortizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
REVENUE

A Food Service provider will do weekly or monthly profit/loss (P/L) reports internally to determine how they are trending and make adjustments if needed to keep the revenue moving in the right direction. This information can be shared in monthly or quarterly meetings with the clients of each College. Typically, the P/L is not shared with the Client, but if the contract is truly a P/L contract, and cost based, then the P/L is normally shared. If it is a shared-cost based contract, then both sides have the responsibility to make the food service break even or profitable. Definitely, doing inventory weekly or monthly in order for the Food Service provider to get a clearer picture of the financials in a more real time setting is critical. Inventories are normally done on a weekly or monthly basis. Usually inventories for c-stores are done monthly and other food service items weekly.

Revenue will be of great importance to a single outsourced Food Service provider. Some assumptions have been made and have been estimated based on the assumption that all of the locations have been operating for a fiscal year and being conservative. The Food Service providers will propose the concepts for each College and the anticipated revenue from their professional expertise through proper marketing. See below what could be the potential revenues. With the food court opening in the near future, there could be some diminishing revenue from vending, food trucks, bookstores' food and beverages, and c-stores. The column to concentrate on is the New Food Court column and the backup information for the revenue is below that chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Revenue Streams for Food Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vending</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Potential Revenue Streams for Food Service
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Food Courts</th>
<th>Students head count</th>
<th>% of Capture per Day</th>
<th>Check Average</th>
<th># Days Fiscal year</th>
<th>Total Sales</th>
<th>Head count per day</th>
<th># of Head count per Concept</th>
<th>Hours Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>43500</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$1,027,557</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>750-2050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$850,392</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>750-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>55000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$974,408</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>412.5</td>
<td>750-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$425,196</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>750-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$944,880</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>750-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$389,763</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>750-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$265,748</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>750-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>31000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$549,212</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>750-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$372,047</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>750-1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

The chart above was based on the head count of each college times an estimated percentage rate of capture, times estimated check average, times the number of days open in a given year, which equals the potential revenue. These numbers are very conservative. A potential food service provider with the proper marketing will drive this revenue upward year after year.

COLLEGE VISITS

Tom Hall, Director of Facilities Planning and Development, and I toured all the colleges' during January 6 through January 16.

City College

We met with President Reneé Martinez and Bob Garcia, Director of College Facilities, to discuss their vision and the mission of the food services at City College along with a tour. At this location, Vermont Avenue is lined with lots of fast food competing for customers. City College had a contract with the City College Foundation which subcontracted with First Class Vending and First Class Vending had a license agreement with Tully's Coffee Shop to operate this area. This contract has expired. Tully's Coffee is interested in the new coffee shop in the student services building. The old coffee shop had been operated through the Foundation for the past three years. A Food Service provider could have this new area up and running within three to four months, depending once again if DSA has to approve any process.

The proposed food court will need an experienced manager to be successful, and this person should have some culinary experience as well. The biggest struggle will be getting the three concept food court operational with limited knowledge of the original design's intended usage, since no utilities were placed at any specific location within the shell of the concepts. The utilities are located in the
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ceiling. The biggest concern is that there is no exhaust hood system located within any of the three shell locations. This exclusion limits a lot of different types of food concepts that could be installed in those shells. Another possibility is that the three shells can be removed to create one open area for a new design. In order to get this project completed and ready to serve students, it could take nine or more months, which is a long time for a Food Service provider or anyone to wait to generate revenue while in the meantime spending money on more construction. The District or the College has to spend the money to get this area ready for use. The expectation from the College is that the Food Service provider or someone else would fund this project and a considerable amount of funds are needed to make this happen. Once at the stage of an RFP process, the Food Service provider can determine the estimated cost of the project. Also the College is asking someone else or a Food Service provider for china for 250 and catering ware for the third floor catering area. The small kitchen on the main floor has no walk-in freezer available; one would have to be installed in the shell area also. City College could handle a national brand in the food court also, with concepts from the Food Service provider's portfolio. From a customer perspective, the coffee shop needs to be a national brand to get the traffic to flow to this area. Both brands need to be able to draw the customers with fast service and great value.

Marketing is absolutely necessary at this College about two to three months before the opening of these areas. If the foot traffic is not captured in the first three weeks of each session, then it is difficult to change the foot traffic of the customer.

Potentially, the current Harry's catering truck could be continued on college with some restrictions as to how close it can be to the student services building. This vendor has a niche market at the college and we should allow the truck to stay as long as it is far enough away from the new building. The food truck needs to be controlled by the single source Food Service provider or the District specialist, in order to consistently maintain permits, pricing, licensing, and cash controls.

**East College**

We met with Tom Furukawa, VP of Administrative Services, and Allison Mah, Interim Director of College Facilities, and toured the College. The mission and goals of the College were reviewed. Currently, they are operating three c-stores and a catering truck, which provide onsite food. There are many major food concepts within walking distance of the College. The c-store which is at present located within the temporary bookstore; will be moving to the new Bookstore building. The new food court will also be located in the same building adjacent to the bookstore. This building is currently under construction and targeted for completion by January, 2015. This area is to have four food concepts with central cashiers. Once the new c-store opens in the Bookstore building, the one currently operating by the modular trailers will close. The c-store in the Student Services building is expected to stay open. Since this is under construction, one would assume that change orders from a Food Service provider would not be accepted due to the added expense. The Bookstore will have an area for
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catering special events and the Food Service provider is expected to purchase the china for 125 to 175 settings and all the catering small wares to go with this to be successful. Currently, off campus restaurants are doing the special events at the Fine Arts, Museum and other locations. A great opportunity exists to bring this back in-house with their new kitchen and possibly some partnership with the culinary colleges.

There is room for the catering truck to remain at its current location with the current menu and price points. This vendor needs to be under the direction of the District specialist or the Food Service provider to maintain consistency of product quality, selling price, hours of service, licensing/permits, and food safety standards.

This location will require a skilled person who also possesses some culinary skills to run the day-to-day operations. Due to the college’s size, a national brand should be considered for the anchor concept of the food court, and fill in with other concepts from the single source Food Service provider.

Marketing at this College will be the most important function for the first three weeks of each new session. The potential is here for great revenues to come through the food court. The split decision for the customer coming out of the parking garage either to turn to go to restaurant row or head to the center of college with a new food service available and where their class is located, is critically driven by effective marketing.

The c-store at the Student Services building will need some professional touches like a makeover; currently it looks like a mismatch of a lot of items, racks and pricing. The store will need to have electricity brought in so this area can brew fresh coffee when needed instead of calling somewhere and having it delivered.

Harbor College

We met with Dr. Ann Tomlinson, VP of Administrative Services, and Bill Englert, Director of College Facilities, and toured the college. The food service is operated by the culinary department here. Very outdated facilities and equipment have lasted longer than their life expectancy. There seems to be no focused organization or they are trying to be all things to all people. Sometimes less is better, but delivering the best you can within reason is the best. It is evident why the Health Department is all over this kitchen and servery.

The new building that is being considered cannot come fast enough for Harbor College. The new location, building and equipment should help grow the program faster than expected. Should this happen with a District specialist or single outsourced Food Service provider on board, it can help manage this new program. Their expertise with the business-side of the food service industry can ensure success, while the educational department will continue teaching the classes needed for that
major. There is potential for the old snack bar building to be a stand-alone concept that fits the needs of that side of the college property and night students. The plan is yet to be determined and there would need to be some surveying of the students on what kind of food is needed there and what the small building could handle. Marketing here will be a big asset for this college also to help draw customers to support the food service. The bookstore has had great opportunities to keep adding food and beverages to their selections due to the lack of food service availability now. Pricing is currently different at the different venues at the College; the need is for some consistency. Two national brands have been mentioned on site: Subway and Taco Bell, which fit the average age of the students at 18-24 years old. Additionally, there are around 400 high school students that could potentially have access to the new food court. It should be noted that sometimes the national brand will require a guaranteed minimum amount of revenue to come to the college or Food Service provider.

Mission College

We met with Daniel Villanueva, VP of Administrative Services, and Walter Bortman, Director of College Facilities, to discuss the mission of food service and took a tour of Mission College. Since this college has the largest overbuilt culinary program in the District, this can be managed with a District specialist or a single outsource Food Service provider. Expectations would be a business-style approach to the program with compliance in the purchasing program, food safety, sanitation, accountability of the books, and cash handling procedures. One of the common threads that each of the culinary programs emphasized was that the delivery of food was very slow and may not be the taste and product that the diversity of customers at each of the Colleges are seeking. The Education Department should continue to teach the classes and provide the training of the students for their future culinary roles and at the same time work very closely with the District specialist or Food Service provider. Depending on the level of skill held by the District specialist or Food Service provider’s management staff, each could also assist with the educational side of business. A single outsource Food Service provider can help with the students to secure jobs and internships in the local area, within the state, or outside the state if desired. The hot dog cart on the lower main walkway of college should be continued by the outside Food Service provider, but accountability for cash handling, permits, licenses, consistent pricing, and quality of product should be ensured. The pastry/coffee/food kiosk in the Campus Center building may not be necessary, since it is so close to the cart and the main food service operation could not get information on the revenue being generated. The small c-store in the Center for Math and Science needs a professional make over with state of the art in equipment and technology. This area has very little room to work with but can be done. Has limited storage, all freshly made product has to be deliver here on a daily bases, due to the limited refrigerator space for holding extra product. Traffic study should be done here to see when the traffic is the highest and then build operating hours around that.
Pierce College

We met with Rolf Schleicher, VP of Administrative Services, Larry Kraus, AVP of Development and Enterprise, and Paul Nieman, Director of College Facilities, to discuss food services at the College and took a tour of the college and current food service locations. The mission of the college food service was discussed along with the current operation of the coffee shop, food truck, and vending. Pierce wants to get a vendor on site soon to open one section of the new food court. Driven by student opinion, Larry mentioned that they were talking to Love Birds Company due to that business already having an agreement with the District. For a short term solution, this might provide immediate service as long as the lease agreement can be canceled or transferred at the appropriate time. The time constraints of bidding and consequent expected operation by August, 2014 would drive this short-term solution. The question was asked if Larry had contacted a Starbucks, Java City or others like Coffee Bean, and the answer was no. The College would like to continue operating the current coffee shop and also keep the food and beverages in the bookstores.

There is room for the food truck catering to stay on site, but it should have an agreement with the single source Food Service provider or specialist of the District so that it can be audited with the other revenue sources.

The College needs to turn all of the food and beverage sales on site over to the Food Service provider if a Food Service provider is contracted. The Food Service provider will need all the revenues possibly available to help with the investment that Pierce is expecting. The College will need to assist and support the food service to assure the food service the first right of refusal on catering opportunities. Long term planning and strategy should encourage the summer camp programs to include food to help support their food service program. Promoting food service through camps could meet with some resistance, because the camp sponsor wants to keep the costs as low as possible. However, recognizing that the more you have the campers stay on site, the more they become comfortable with the facilities and convenience and the better chance they will attend that College. A Food Service provider could have this food service operational within a three month period; the only hurdle could be required DSA approval of some processes.

Revenue at this college has the potential to be high, with the right concepts. A possible national brand could be introduced with the Food Service provider’s in-house brands to support the whole food court concept. The College will have to be flexible regarding scheduled openings. Food Service has the first three weeks of each term or semester to create the optimal traffic patterns for students. If not captured during those three weeks, they are lost until the next term. To help with optimization, there needs to be a major marketing program for Pierce. Currently there is very little promotion to let visitors know what food service is available on site. Aggressive advertising should be implemented. If Pierce brings
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in a temporary vendor for a certain period of time, that vendor should be required to vigorously market the new area and that concept.

A big expense a Food Service provider or the College will incur is for the purchase of small wares, serving utensils, pots and pans, catering ware, and mobile carts to list a few of the necessary items. Currently, a new food court is sitting empty, and it sounds as if the punch list is still incomplete. Pierce was talking about dividing up the kitchen into four different sections to allow separate outside vendors; from past experience, this model usually turns into a mess and no one takes ownership of the complete kitchen for sanitation, sharing of cooler and freezer space, and dry storage.

Southwest College

We met with Ferris Tremble, VP of Administrative Services, and Randy Craig, Director of College Facilities and took a walking tour of the college. There are no close street vendors or restaurants within a short walk, which means driving not walking. Currently Southwest is renovating the Cox building which includes an 800sf coffee/pastry concept with the counter and storage around 80sf, which is not much space for this concept; a delivery will have to be made here every day with food and backup supplies. After reviewing the drawing, of note is that there are no 220 volt plugs for the coffee or espresso machines. It is highly recommended that those get put in now before it is turned over to the College; it sounded like it would be no big deal according to the head electrician of the project. This coffee shop location is on the second floor with a balcony overlooking the main intersection of the college. There is a small concession room in the athletic building that could be used by the Food Service provider during the daytime or night time hours as long as there is no athletic event going on. In the near future there is a 550sf allocated space in the new School of Nursing, Math and Science building for food service. This is not much space for what the vision is; this space is ideal for a national brand like a Starbucks, Einstein’s or another singular brand. Very little support space exists behind the counters. Some interest has been voiced for the theater to have special events with one-day catering passes. It was mentioned that the catering for special event functions for the College amounts to approximately 80K from the local outside restaurants. The Child Development Center has a large commercial kitchen that is potentially underutilized. Currently there are no plans to have a kitchen on the site for producing food for catering events at the College. There is a possibility of using another LACCD kitchen for production and then transporting the ordered food products but this method has some risk to it.

Trade Tech College

We met with Mary Gallagher, VP of Administrative Services, Bill Gasper AVP of Administrative Services, and Bill Smith, Director of College Facilities, then took a tour of the current facilities. The
dining room and serving line is really outdated and equipment has passed its life expectancy. With such old facilities, it is hard to make it look clean and keep it that way all the time. The sanitation level of the space needs some special attention or a major cleaning session. A District specialist or a single outsourced Food Service provider approach would help here in keeping the industry standards met and keeping up-to-date equipment and serving equipment. There was a conversation that in the near future the possibility exists of building a new culinary/bakery arts program that would include some type of international food court concept to meet the diverse customers' taste. When designing this new area, maybe some of the equipment and small wares from Mission College could be figured into the project to help with cost reduction. It was reported that the bakery products are not getting out early enough in the mornings and also running out once they are put out for purchase. With marketing and a sense of current sales, improvements could be made to get the right supply and demands met. Generally, there is a good profit margin in bakery products. Adopting a business approach could help make the department and food service create some profits to help them stay up with the future trends.

Since the culinary program already does all the catering for the special events on college, gains could be realized from pricing the functions at the proper price and purchasing the foods from a central supplier.

A specialist or single outsourced Food Service provider will control all the selling prices of items to be consistent throughout the whole college. It is necessary to keep the truck caterer and the vending up-to-date with the licenses, permits, hours of operations, accountability of cash handling and auditing of the commissions or space rent. A single outsourced Food Service provider will have the resources to help with catering of special events from within the state, region and/or corporate headquarters. With those added resources, there is no catered event ever too big to handle unless space is the issue.

Marketing will contribute a huge improvement for the revenue stream to the College and food service. There are a lot of opportunities that surround the college site for delivery or coming to a new food court when a more modern venue attracts customers. Currently, a lot of visitors utilize the catering truck on a daily basis for their meal of the day; and that menu/routine loses its appeal eventually. Maybe creating a catering to-go menu to be handed out to future customers to order from for pickup or delivery could be just one new idea since there is a delivery vehicle already there on site.

Valley College

We met with Christopher Bonvento, VP of Administrative Services, and Tom Lopez, Director of College Facilities. As the old food service building was almost torn down and being hauled away, there wasn't much to observe. Currently Valley has a local catering truck doing the food service on college and had a second truck for the winter term. Since there was not enough business for the second truck to remain, they will try it again during spring session. A few fast foods exist around the college.
like Carl Jr., Sharky's and a couple of others, but they are three-four blocks from the center of college. The new food service area will be completed by August 2015. Within the building will be a 4-5 concept food court on the main level of the building and a coffee shop on the other end of the L-shaped building. Catering will become of greater importance once the renovation of the administration building gets turned into a conference center for the College and the community. Certainly, the kitchen in the new building needs to be adequate to produce the volume of food needed for these anticipated special occasions. Vending seems adequate especially during the construction phase of the new food service building. Some attention needs to be paid to the vending machines under the canopy by the bookstore and large meeting room for food safety and sanitation. With the kind of food court, conferences, and camps planned, the manager of the food service should have some culinary background with management skills. For now, the truck or trucks are providing the needed service. Once the building opens for food service, the truck caterer closest to the building should be relocated at least 1000 feet out from the food court. With one single outsource Food Service provider, all of the prices can be consistent throughout the College.

**West College**

We met with Ken Takeda, VP of Administration Services, Larry Packham, College Enterprise Manager, and Allan Hansen, Director of College Facilities, and then toured the College. Currently, they have a vendor operating their food court. When asked if the current vendor is meeting the expectations of the College, the answer was “not totally.” Some of the reasons given were the College and some were the vendor. The service for food is slow, and empty shelves are too often visible for grab and go items. After listening to customers outside on the patio for twenty minutes, the common theme was slow service and the fact that from one day to the next the sandwich is different, so a lack of consistency exists in the quality of product. By having a selected vendor at the College already should give the administrator more power to get things accomplished and to reduce the customer concerns. After taking the tour of the “back of the house,” it should be noted that the vendor is not performing proper food safety practices nor meeting sanitation standards. Marketing is lacking here also; one sign was hanging on the fence by the parking garage on the hill. There could be another c-store/coffee shop on site on the major walkway from the center of college to the parking garage on the hill; there seems to be numerous potential areas where a small store could be located. This would capture more revenue also for the vendor, but again has initial cost. With Café now located at a major bus stop for the community on college; that location should drive revenues for the vendor. There is a bus stopping about every 10-15 minutes throughout the day. Marketing needs to be extremely aggressive in this area encouraging customers to stop by the Café.

Some of the profits from the c-store on site should go back into the location for upgrades and the professional look of a true c-store. Currently with no catering trucks on site, and if no additional area
is added by the parking garage on the hill, a catering truck coming back could be considered, but discussions need to be held with their vendor on this. This College is not big enough for a national brand, their single source Food Service provider should do some research on this to see if a regional offering would help build revenues.
Recommendations for Improvements/Growth/Sustainability

LACCD should:

1. Outsource for a single Food Service provider with a single RFP or RFQ, OR
   a. Hire a District food service specialist for all the Colleges AND
   b. Move all revenues to food service in either selection.
2. Assist with the expenses that will immediately burden food service operations for some period of time in either selection.
3. Create a structure of reporting that will lead and support the food services at the Colleges and allow them to thrive.
4. Change the mindset from a Food Service provider necessity to a partner relationship.
5. Consider the amount of investment that is needed by each College and determine the funding source(s).
6. Plan how to maintain food safety and sanitation as a serious consideration.
7. Centralize POS system, cash handling, auditing, and food purchasing for the whole District.
8. Create more real-time P/L reports.
9. Going forward with any new food service, develop the budget to include the equipment, construction and an allocated amount for small wares.
10. Ensure that an operational specialist should help review the plans for future building of food service sites.

Next steps will be for LACCD to set up a meeting to discuss the report further, to answer and address questions and concerns, and to provide clarifications of the report’s content.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry Throener
Food Program Consultant
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## Qualitative Research by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Date Conducted</th>
<th>Qualitative Research Conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| City      | 11/2/15        | - 1 Focus Group of 12 Faculty & Staff, 2:00 pm  
|           |                | - 12 Interviews with Students |
| East      | 11/6/15        | - 1 Focus Group of 15 Students, 10:00 am  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 14 Faculty & Staff, 12:00 pm |
| Harbor    | 11/12/15       | - 1 Focus Group of 20 Students, 10:00 am  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 15 Faculty & Staff, 12:00 pm  
|           |                | - 3 Interviews with Culinary Students |
| Mission   | 11/3/15        | - 1 Focus Group of 23 Culinary Students, 10:30 am  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 9 Faculty & Staff, 12:00 pm  
|           |                | - 13 Interviews with Students  
|           |                | - 1 Interview with Staff |
| Pierce    | 11/4/15        | - 1 Focus Group of 23 Students, 10:00 am  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 17 Faculty & Staff, 1:30 pm |
| Southwest | 11/9/16        | - 1 Focus Group of 14 Students, 12:00 pm  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 18 Faculty & Staff, 3:30 pm |
| Trade-Tech| 11/5/15        | - 1 Focus Group of 18 Students, 5:00 pm  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 11 Faculty & Staff, 7:00 pm  
|           |                | - 10 Interviews with Faculty & Staff |
| Valley    | 11/10/15       | - 1 Focus Group of 10 Faculty & Staff, 11:15 am  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 12 Students, 2:00 pm  
| West      | 11/5/15        | - 1 Focus Group of 8 Students, 11:00 am  
|           |                | - 1 Focus Group of 11 Faculty & Staff, 1:00 pm |
## Online Survey Respondent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Harbor</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Pierce</th>
<th>South-west</th>
<th>Trade-Tech</th>
<th>Valley</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>14,608</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3. On average, how many times per week do you purchase food on campus?
### Primary Food Purchase Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bookstore</th>
<th>Café or Coffee Shop</th>
<th>Cafeteria</th>
<th>Food Truck</th>
<th>Vending Machine</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Do Not Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA City College</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East LA College</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Harbor College</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Mission College</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce College</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Southwest College</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Trade-Technical College</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Valley College</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West LA College*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Select where you **primarily** purchase food on campus? (Select one) + Q4a. responses that fall into a Q4. response category

*Note that the café on campus at West closed in late October shortly following data collection and before the focus groups*
Food Purchase Location – Other (Among Purchasers)

Paws/Husky Store/Student store: 27%
Across the street/nearby restaurants/off campus: 23%
Fast food restaurant: 16%
All of the above: 4%
Convenience store: 3%
Bring my own food: 3%
Club fundraising: 2%
Culinary arts program: 2%
Local vendors/cart: 2%
Healthy food: 2%
Cheap food: 1%
Do not eat in campus: 1%
Closest possible (unspecified): 1%
Other: 12%
Nothing: 0%
Don't know: 0%

Q4a. If you selected Other, where else on campus do you primarily purchase meals or snacks? (Open-end, not including responses that fall into a Q4. response category)
Satisfaction With Food (Among Purchasers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Sat. Unsat. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of servers or cashiers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu is clearly visible</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service location</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of food service area</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices are clearly visible</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service hours</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of food</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)

n = 8555
## Satisfaction With Food Continued (Among Purchasers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Sat. Unsat. Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of servers or cashiers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu is clearly visible</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service location</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of food service area</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices are clearly visible</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service hours</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of food</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste of food</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of food choices</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of dining area</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of dining area</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of covered dining area</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate seating in dining area</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of healthy food choices</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of nutritional...</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Based on where you **primarily** purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)

n = 8555
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### Interest in Food Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Type</th>
<th>Very High Interest</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low Interest</th>
<th>Total High + Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshly prepared</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot food</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made-to-order</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-calorie</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snacks (vending machine)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetarian</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gluten-free</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegan</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Rate your interest level for each food choice you want on campus. (Rate each)
**Interest in Specific Foods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Total High + Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salads</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwiches</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraps</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soups</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacos</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzas</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastas</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritos</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sushi</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waffles</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagels</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash browns</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noodles</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastries</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffins</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotdogs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughnuts</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
Q8. Select your top choice for the food item you most want on campus. (Select one)
Interest in Beverages

Fruit smoothies and juices
- Very High Interest: 57%
- High: 21%
- Moderate: 14%
- Low: 4%
- Very Low: 4%
- Total High + Very High: 78%

Coffee drinks (latte, espresso, iced)
- Very High Interest: 49%
- High: 19%
- Moderate: 18%
- Low: 6%
- Very Low: 9%
- Total High + Very High: 67%

Tea (boba, green, specialty, regular)
- Very High Interest: 47%
- High: 21%
- Moderate: 19%
- Low: 6%
- Very Low: 7%
- Total High + Very High: 68%

Soda
- Very High Interest: 18%
- High: 11%
- Moderate: 24%
- Low: 15%
- Very Low: 32%
- Total High + Very High: 29%

Q9. Rate your interest level for each beverage you want on campus. (Rate each)
Q12. Select the time of day you **primarily** want food available? (Select all that apply)
Q12. Select the **time** of day you **primarily** want food available? (Select all that apply)
## Other Suggestions Open Ends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More variety/food options</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need cafeteria/Food court/Restaurant</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy food/drink</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More affordable/Lower prices</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh food/drink</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/Tasty/Good quality food</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining area/Available seats and tables/Better places to eat</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better location/More locations/Accessible</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salad/Salad bar/Vegetables</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner/More sanitized</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have branded/established franchises/chains</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More vegetarian/vegan options</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better/More functional vending machines</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More/Better food trucks</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opening hours</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic food/drink</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve food at night</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster service/Fewer lines</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/More/Better coffee</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better/Friendlier customer service</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot food</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Only showing responses mentioned by ≥ 2% of respondents*
### Reasons for Not Eating on Campus (Among Non-Purchasers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very High Influence</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low Influence</th>
<th>Total High + Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to bring my own food</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of variety</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to eat at off-campus restaurants</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not like the type of food that is available</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low quality of food</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service locations on campus are not conveniently located</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food services are not open during the times I am on campus</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices are too expensive</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose **NOT** to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)  
\[ n = 5961 \]
Findings by Campus
Focus Group Findings - City

- There was overwhelming agreement that City College has very limited food options on campus
  - Most people bring their lunch, go off campus, or order food for delivery
  - Faculty and staff don’t mind driving off campus for lunch

- Students, faculty, and staff do not just have a limited amount of money to spend, but they also have limited time to spend actually going out and getting food
  - Downsides to food truck: it’s one of the very few options, and only option for something “hot” and often the line is very long because everyone is line for the same/only thing

- There is strong interest in expanding current food offerings
  - Interest in healthy options was especially high
  - Some students suggested “borrowing” culinary students from other schools to serve food at City
Focus Group Findings, Cont. - City

- Students, faculty, and staff all indicated they would be more likely to stay on campus if there were more food options
  - Students mentioned that they would be more likely to eat healthier if there were healthy options

- Faculty and staff were more attuned to barriers and limitations of possible changes (contracts, difficulty finding vendor willing to do year round given off-peak times, limitations of existing facilities, etc.) than students
Reasons for Not Eating on Campus (Among Non-Purchasers) - City

Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence

- Lack of variety: 3.73
- Do not like the type of food that is available: 3.58
- I prefer to bring my own food: 3.57
- Low quality of food: 3.40
- I prefer to eat at off-campus restaurants: 3.35
- Prices are too expensive: 3.35
- Food service locations on campus are not conveniently located: 3.10
- Food services are not open during the times I am on campus: 2.74
Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)
1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest

Interest in Food Items - City

Mean Interest

- Fruit: 4.28
- Salads: 4.17
- Sandwiches: 4.08
- Chicken: 3.78
- Wraps: 3.74
- Soups: 3.73
- Tacos: 3.62
- Pizzas: 3.52
- Burritos: 3.48
- Pastas: 3.47
- Eggs: 3.46
- Burgers: 3.43
- Bagels: 3.41
- Noodles: 3.35
- Sushi: 3.35
- Pastries: 3.26
- Hash browns: 3.25
- Waffles: 3.25
- Muffins: 3.20
- Hotdogs: 2.92
- Doughnuts: 2.81
Focus Group Findings - East

- Students and staff are not satisfied with the on-campus options
  - The food truck is not very good, has long lines, and the food they serve is greasy and not healthy
  - The student store and bookstore sell mostly junk food and in both groups there were a couple of people who didn’t even know they existed until the group
  - The only food available at night is the vending machines

- While faculty and staff mostly bring food from home, many students often just don’t eat at all when they’re on campus
  - There are many options within walking distance from campus, but they aren’t very affordable for students and many are fast food

- There’s a lot of demand for fresh, healthy food with variety but there’s also concern that if that kind of food is brought to campus it won’t be priced affordably for students
Many noted the lack of places to sit and eat on campus

Students and staff expressed a desire for a central cafeteria or food court with a dining area
  - This is seen as meeting not just the basic need for food, but as also an important feature for building a more cohesive community
  - There is strong opposition to their food needs being met by bringing in chain restaurants, largely because they already feel they have those options off campus
  - Instead, some in both groups brought up the idea of having culinary students from other campuses come prepare food on campus at East

Staff and faculty expressed concern that the District will “take over” their food service and disregard what those at East want
Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)

1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence

Mean Influence

- Lack of variety: 3.52
- I prefer to bring my own food: 3.47
- Do not like the type of food that is available: 3.34
- I prefer to eat at off-campus restaurants: 3.34
- Food service locations on campus are not conveniently located: 3.31
- Low quality of food: 3.23
- Prices are too expensive: 3.12
- Food services are not open during the times I am on campus: 2.76
Satisfaction With Food (Among Purchasers) - East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Mean Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of servers or cashiers</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu is clearly visible</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices are clearly visible</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of food service area</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of food</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service hours</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste of food</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service location</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of food choices</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of dining area</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of dining area</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of covered dining area</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of healthy food choices</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate seating in dining area</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of nutritional information</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)
1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest

- Fruit: 4.38
- Salads: 4.19
- Sandwiches: 4.16
- Chicken: 3.94
- Tacos: 3.78
- Soups: 3.78
- Wraps: 3.76
- Pastas: 3.71
- Pizzas: 3.69
- Burritos: 3.61
- Burgers: 3.58
- Noodles: 3.52
- Eggs: 3.49
- Bagels: 3.49
- Waffles: 3.44
- Hash browns: 3.44
- Pastries: 3.42
- Muffins: 3.37
- Sushi: 3.33
- Hotdogs: 3.15
- Doughnuts: 2.94
Focus Group Findings - Harbor

- Students and staff are not satisfied with the current offerings on campus
  - Students feel the cafeteria, bookstore, and food truck all charge too much for what you get
  - Faculty and staff emphasized that most of the food that’s currently available is not very healthy

- Many like the idea of the culinary program and say they would like to support it, but few currently buy food from the culinary-run cafeteria
  - In both groups, there was a lot of concern about the quality of the food being served, including serious concerns about sanitation and food safety
  - Culinary students did not seem aware of the cafeteria’s image
  - The current dated facilities and layout also contribute to the negative perceptions of the food served (and long lines), but there is optimism among some that the new building will help the situation
  - Staff and faculty patronize the bistro, but most students perceive it as meant for staff and not for students
Focus Group Findings, Cont. - Harbor

- There was a sense that those at the culinary program are not open to criticism or interested in improving, and many worry that any attempt to bring in other food options will be met with resistance.

- Both staff and students would also like to see something else for students and faculty who are on campus in the evening besides vending machines and to see food in more locations on campus.
Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence
### Satisfaction With Food (Among Purchasers) - Harbor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Feature</th>
<th>Mean Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service location</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of servers or cashiers</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of food service hours</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of food</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste of food</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of food service area</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of dining area</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate seating in dining area</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu is clearly visible</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of food choices</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of dining area</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of covered dining area</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices are clearly visible</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of healthy food choices</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of nutritional information</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)
1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest

Interest in Food Items - Harbor

Mean Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salads</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwiches</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacos</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soups</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzas</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraps</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritos</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastas</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagels</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash browns</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastries</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waffles</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffins</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noodles</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotdogs</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sushi</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughnuts</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group Findings - Mission

- Many at Mission acknowledge that compared to other schools, they have it pretty good.

- Most who are not affiliated with the culinary program are aware of it and eat at the cafeteria at least occasionally.
  - Several students and staff expressed concerns over speed of service and price—they don’t just think that they think they’re paying a lot, but feel they don’t get a lot of bang for their buck.
  - That said, they appreciate the specialness of the program and believe that bringing in an additional outside vendor would take away from it.

- Culinary arts students, faculty, and staff are very proud and protective of their program and their cafeteria.
  - Most people affiliated with the program eat at the cafeteria themselves.
  - Many acknowledge that there are some perceptions that service is slow.
Focus Group Findings, Cont. - Mission

- Those affiliated with culinary arts see an opportunity for expanding marketing to increase customers and foot traffic to the cafeteria
  - Some culinary students also mentioned the possibility of contributing their services to campuses with no culinary arts program

- Both culinary and non-culinary students would like to see more food on the East side of campus near the fitness center
Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence
Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)

1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
### Interest in Food Items - Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Item</th>
<th>Mean Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salads</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwiches</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soups</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraps</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastas</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacos</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzas</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritos</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash browns</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagels</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastries</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noodles</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waffles</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffins</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sushi</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotdogs</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughnuts</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest
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Focus Group Findings - Pierce

- There was consensus that the current options are not adequate
  - The food trucks and coffee shop options get tiresome, don’t have many healthy options, and don’t have food that seems fresh
  - There are many parts of the expansive campus that have no food at all or just have vending machines (many of which are broken)

- Some students and staff leave campus, primarily by car, but it takes a long time and it’s often difficult to find parking

- The lack of food options is not just seen as a big problem, but a hardship, and as being harmful to the ability of students to learn, grow, and be productive
  - There’s demand for healthy, affordable options, but most of all everyone is just desperate for something more than what they have right now
  - Students and staff both feel having more numerous, better food options won’t just make students’ lives easier, it will make them better students with improved attention spans and more time to study
The lack of a gathering space that a cafeteria provides is also seen as taking a toll on the sense of community on the campus.

- Students feel deceived by the empty cafeteria, and say they keep being told it will open eventually but nothing ever happens.
- Participants feel putting something in the empty cafeteria would create more of a sense of community, allowing students and staff more opportunity to meet one another.

Staff think there is too much concern about food service on campus making a profit when it should really be seen as just that – a service that they need to provide their students in order for them to function.
Reasons for Not Eating on Campus (Among Non-Purchasers) - Pierce

Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)

1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence

- I prefer to bring my own food: 3.58
- Lack of variety: 3.50
- Do not like the type of food that is available: 3.34
- Low quality of food: 3.20
- Prices are too expensive: 3.15
- I prefer to eat at off-campus restaurants: 3.14
- Food service locations on campus are not conveniently located: 2.96
- Food services are not open during the times I am on campus: 2.56
Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)
1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
**Interest in Food Items - Pierce**

**Mean Interest**

- **Fruit** 4.20
- **Salads** 4.12
- **Sandwiches** 4.11
- **Chicken** 3.81
- **Wraps** 3.76
- **Tacos** 3.71
- **Pizzas** 3.65
- **Soups** 3.65
- **Pastas** 3.63
- **Burritos** 3.62
- **Burgers** 3.61
- **Noodles** 3.41
- **Bagels** 3.39
- **Hash browns** 3.36
- **Pastries** 3.31
- **Waffles** 3.28
- **Eggs** 3.28
- **Sushi** 3.26
- **Muffins** 3.25
- **Hotdogs** 3.06
- **Doughnuts** 2.88

**Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)**

1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest
Focus Group Findings - Southwest

- There's consensus that options on campus are unhealthy and overpriced
  - The two food trucks don't have healthy options, are expensive, and have little variety
  - The bookstore mostly sells chips, soda, and candy, and at a higher price than off campus
  - Both staff and students worried about the large number of students who have difficulty affording food and the fact that current options do not accept EBT cards
  - Students and staff also expressed concern about offering primarily high-sodium, high-sugar-content foods in the midst of a community with high rates of diabetes, high blood pressure, and obesity
Focus Group Findings, Cont. - Southwest

There was widespread agreement that it isn’t just the campus that lacks healthy options, but the surrounding community, too

- Students feel this is an injustice, and doubt change will happen because the demographics of the student body and its location make it a low priority relative to other schools
- Staff are more hopeful that offering affordable, healthy food on campus is possible and see changing food service as an opportunity to change the entire community for the better

There was near unanimous desire for a cafeteria with affordable, fresh food and a dining area

- Staff emphasized that this would be a positive for the social environment
- The possibility of a cafeteria providing work-study jobs for students was also important
- Respondents would welcome franchises so long as they have fresh food and healthy options
Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence
Satisfaction With Food (Among Purchasers) - Southwest

**Mean Satisfaction**

- Friendliness of servers or cashiers: 3.90
- Convenience of food service location: 3.54
- Convenience of food service hours: 3.51
- Speed of service: 3.49
- Temperature of food: 3.48
- Menu is clearly visible: 3.39
- Cleanliness of food service area: 3.37
- Taste of food: 3.30
- Value for money: 3.09
- Prices are clearly visible: 3.01
- Variety of food choices: 2.99
- Location of dining area: 2.80
- Cleanliness of dining area: 2.68
- Availability of healthy food choices: 2.62
- Adequate seating in dining area: 2.51
- Availability of nutritional information: 2.40
- Availability of covered dining area: 2.29

Q5. Based on where you **primarily** purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)

1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
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Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest
Focus Group Findings – Trade-Tech

- Students, staff, and faculty are largely satisfied with the current offerings on campus
  - Most agreed that the cafeteria serves high-quality food and that the prices and portion sizes are reasonable
  - Many feel a loyalty to the food truck given its long history at the college
  - Some would like to see expanded hours for the food truck and/or cafeteria

- The culinary program is a big source of pride even for those not affiliated with it
  - It’s seen as a big part of the community and most want to support it by eating there
  - Students and staff are protective of the program and cafeteria and do not want to see anything come in that would undermine it
  - Even those who don’t eat there often are very opposed to bringing in anything else
Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence

- I prefer to bring my own food: 3.51
- Prices are too expensive: 3.08
- I prefer to eat at off-campus restaurants: 2.99
- Lack of variety: 2.96
- Low quality of food: 2.92
- Do not like the type of food that is available: 2.91
- Food services are not open during the times I am on campus: 2.59
- Food service locations on campus are not conveniently located: 2.50
Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)

1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
Interest in Food Items – Trade-Tech

Mean Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Item</th>
<th>Mean Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salads</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwiches</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soups</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacos</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraps</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritos</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzas</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastas</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash browns</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastries</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waffles</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagels</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffins</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noodles</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sushi</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotdogs</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughnuts</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest
LA Valley College
Focus Group Findings - Valley

- While there was some dissatisfaction with the current food offerings, it was not all that intense
  - The food truck is relatively well-liked
    - Downsides to the food truck include lack of variety, lack of healthy options, and long lines
  - There are a handful of off-campus options within walking distance as well, but they tend to have long lines and aren’t well-liked
  - Many would like to see food options available earlier in the morning and later in the evening
    - There was a big emphasis at Valley on having food service at breakfast time
Focus Group Findings, Cont. - Valley

- Students and staff both expressed a desire for a cafeteria, even those who didn’t seem aware that a new cafeteria will be opening soon
  - They’d like to see it serve healthy, fresh food *quickly*
  - Students and staff were both eager to have “healthy” name brands but were open to the idea of having one vendor operate multiple stations
  - For staff, being able to get high quality food catered for meetings was also important

- Although it’s centrally located, many don’t think the new cafeteria will be enough to serve the whole campus and feel it needs to be supplemented with smaller kiosks or carts
Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)

1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence
Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)
1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
### Interest in Food Items - Valley

#### Mean Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Interest Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salads</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwiches</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraps</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacos</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soups</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzas</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastas</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritos</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagels</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash browns</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noodles</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waffles</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffins</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastries</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sushi</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotdogs</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughnuts</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)

1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest
Focus Group Findings - West

- Students and staff agreed that the options on campus now are inadequate
  - The food truck is seen as overpriced and mediocre as well as slow
  - The student store also lacks healthy options and isn’t conveniently located

- While there are some off-campus options within walking distance and many more within driving distance, few feel they can spare the time to frequent them

- The situation is a high priority for students and staff – in both groups there was talk about how it is taking a toll on students, not just physically, but mentally
  - Students also perceive the lack of action as reflecting an overall lack of caring about them and worry about it making the campus less attractive to prospective students
Focus Group Findings, Cont. - West

- There’s a strong interest in putting something in the currently vacant space that used to house Café West
  - Both groups acknowledge that Café West was closed because of low sales
  - However, they are adamant it deserved to go out of business and agree they would frequent and support an establishment that offered affordable, healthy, quality food

- In addition to leaving a void in food service, the closure of the indoor seating area at Café West is seen as a big loss as well, as there’s no longer an indoor space where students are allowed to eat
Reasons for Not Eating on Campus (Among Non-Purchasers) - West

Q14. Rate the level of influence each factor has on why you choose NOT to regularly eat on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low influence through 5 - Very high influence

- I prefer to bring my own food: 3.64
- Prices are too expensive: 3.36
- Low quality of food: 3.36
- Do not like the type of food that is available: 3.35
- Lack of variety: 3.32
- I prefer to eat at off-campus restaurants: 3.22
- Food services are not open during the times I am on campus: 2.87
- Food service locations on campus are not conveniently located: 2.35
Q5. Based on where you primarily purchase food on campus, rate your satisfaction level with each. (Rate each)

1 - Very low satisfaction through 5 - Very high satisfaction
Interest in Food Items - West

Mean Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Item</th>
<th>Interest Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salads</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwiches</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soups</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraps</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacos</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzas</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastas</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burritos</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagels</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noodles</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffins</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash browns</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waffles</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastries</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sushi</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotdogs</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughnuts</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. Rate your interest level for each food item you want on campus. (Rate each)
1 - Very low interest through 5 - Very high interest
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Subject: Item CH5 – Approve West Los Angeles College Revised Mission Statement

Enclosed for your review is background information regarding CH5 – Approve West Los Angeles College Revised Mission Statement.

Submitted By: Ryan Cornner, Vice Chancellor, Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness

Date: August 10, 2016
Subject: APPROVE WEST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE REVISED MISSION STATEMENT

Approve the revised Mission Statement for West Los Angeles College (WLAC).

Background: Accreditation standards require that colleges regularly review their mission statements to ensure that they continue to reflect the institution’s broad educational purpose, intended population, type of degrees and other credentials offered, and commitment to achieving student learning. The standards also require Board of Trustees approval of the college mission statement since it is central to institutional planning and decision-making. WLAC was approved to offer a bachelor degree in dental hygiene from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office on October 23, 2015.

To ensure continued compliance with Standard I.A.1 and Eligibility Requirement 6, the College has updated its mission statement.

Approved by: Francisco C. Rodriguez, Chancellor

Chancellor and Secretary of the Board of Trustees

By ___________________________ Date ____________
West Los Angeles College
Mission Statement Change
Executive Summary
July 20, 2016

Rationale for Change

The Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees approved West Los Angeles College’s current mission statement on May 15, 2010. In July 2015, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College (ACCJC) adopted new Accreditation Standards. Standard I.A.1 requires that “[t]he mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the type of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement.” While the College’s current mission statement met the Standard at the time of reaffirmation of accreditation, the addition of the baccalaureate degree necessitates an update to the mission statement.

WLAC was approved to offer a bachelor degree in dental hygiene from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office on October 23, 2015. On January 22, 2016, the substantive change for the bachelor degree program was approved by ACCJC. The ACCJC Policy on Accreditation of Baccalaureate Degrees adopted on June 10, 2016 at the ACCJC Commission Meeting includes increased scrutiny for Standard I.A.1. The policy states: “Baccalaureate degrees generally extend beyond previously identified credentials, service areas, and intended student populations. Member institutions may need to make changes within the institutional mission to reflect these differences.” WLAC has updated the mission to indicate it offers both associate and baccalaureate degrees—undergraduate degrees. To ensure continued compliance with Standard I.A.1 and Eligibility Requirement 5 as WLAC welcomes its first cohort of baccalaureate students, the College must update its mission statement.

Current Mission Statement, with Proposed Change Indicated in Red

- West Los Angeles College provides a transformative educational experience.
- West fosters a diverse learning community dedicated to student success.
- Through quality instruction and supportive services, the College develops leaders who encourage excellence in others.
- A West education enriches students with the knowledge and skills needed to earn certificates and undergraduate degrees, to transfer, to build careers, and to pursue life-long learning.

Mission Statement Review Process

The mission statement is reviewed annually at the all-College Leadership Retreat. Anticipating an ACCJC site visit in Fall 2016 for the substantive change in Dental Hygiene, the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) proposed a revision to the mission statement in April 2016. The revised mission statement was discussed at the Leadership Retreat on April 29, 2016. It was ratified by 95% of Retreat participants who voted. On May 5, 2016, College Council and subsequently, Academic Senate, on May 10, 2016, ratified the revised Mission Statement. Collectively, the input received was representative of faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students.
West Los Angeles College

Revision of the Mission Statement

Presentation to the
Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees
Institutional Effectiveness & Student Success Committee

Robert Sprague, Interim President
Aracely Aguiar, Acting Vice President

July 20, 2016
Rationale for Change

With the addition of the baccalaureate degree in Dental Hygiene and the new ACCJC Policy on the Baccalaureate Degree, West must revise its mission statement to clarify the "types of degrees and other credentials it offers" (Standard I.A.1 and Eligibility Requirement 6).
WLAC Mission Statement

West Los Angeles College provides a transformative educational experience.

- West fosters a diverse learning community dedicated to student success.
- Through quality instruction and supportive services, the college develops leaders who encourage excellence in others.
- A West education enriches students with the knowledge and skills needed to earn certificates and undergraduate degrees, to transfer, to build careers, and to pursue lifelong learning.

WLAC has added the word “undergraduate” to the mission statement to encompass both associate and baccalaureate degrees.
Process

January 22, 2016: ACCJC approved baccalaureate degree in Dental Hygiene

April 11, 2016: Accreditation Steering Committee ratified revised mission statement

April 29, 2016: Mission statement revision presented to campus community at Leadership Retreat; 95% of participants who voted ratified the revision

May 5, 2016: College Council ratified the revision

May 10, 2016: Academic Senate ratified the revision
LEAD CONSTRUCTION COUNSEL MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Trustees
   Francisco C. Rodriguez, Chancellor
   Adriana Barrera, Deputy Chancellor

Cc: James D. O’Reilly, Chief Facilities Executive
    Tom Hall, Director, Facilities Planning and Development

From: John P. Dacey, Esq., Lead Construction Counsel

Date: August 4, 2016

Re: Memorandum regarding Item VIII. A. on Com. No. FPD1 for consideration on the August 10, 2016 Report from Facilities Planning and Development

I. INTRODUCTION

This Memorandum addresses one (1) PBA change order item listed in the August 10, 2016 Report from Facilities Planning and Development. The item is a Request from Facilities Planning and Development to ratify Amendment No. 11 to Design-Build Agreement No. 33801 with Harper Construction Company for additional Design-Build services for the Science Career and Mathematics Building project at East Los Angeles College at a cost not to exceed $79,916 inclusive of eligible reimbursable expenses.

The background information set forth in this Memorandum has been provided to me by the Program Management Office (“PMO”) and/or the College Project Team (“CPT”) from the East LA College. I have assumed the information provided is accurate and correct for the purpose of forming my conclusions set forth in Section II.
II. **AMENDMENT NO. 11 TO DESIGN-BUILD AGREEMENT NO. 33801 WITH HARPER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY FOR ADDITIONAL DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES FOR THE SCIENCE CAREER AND MATHEMATICS BUILDING PROJECT AT EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED $79,916**

This item reports as additional Design-Build services for the Science Career and Mathematics Building project at East Los Angeles College at a cost not to exceed $79,916 inclusive of eligible reimbursable expenses.

The Original Design-Build Contract amount at time of award was $52,675,465. Prior approved Change Orders total $7,957,529 for a Revised Contract Amount of $60,632,994.

The current Change Order before the Board for ratification is in the amount of $79,916 which would make the new Revised Contract Amount $60,712,910.

The PMO and CPT report that the items making up the $79,916 include extra work consisting of:

1. “Requests by the College (designed and constructed adjacent storage rooms to accommodate a new microbiology lab equipment room);

2. Unforeseen conditions (designed and constructed a retaining wall to protect the existing campus electrical switchgear on the southeast corner of the site not shown correctly on as-built drawings; and

3. Additional requirements (designed and installed drought tolerant landscape and irrigation system in accordance with new requirements of the Division of the State Architect and revised the specification for fire and smoke dampers from galvanized steel to stainless steel to be consistent with the stainless steel ductwork per the Architect of Record).”

The Project involves the new construction of a Science Career and Mathematics Building.

Regarding the “Unforeseen Conditions” described in “(2)” above, public entities are required to pay a contractor such extra work as a matter of statutory law. Apparently here, there were incorrect as-built drawings provided to the Contractor which led to this additional work being required after the Contractor had designed the Project.

Regarding the “Additional Requirements” described in “(3)” above, such work was apparently required by the Division of the State Architect and the Architect of Record.
and therefore were apparently not known at the time the contractor originally designed the project.

Regarding the “Requests by the College” described in “(1)” above which consisted of designing and constructing adjacent storage rooms to accommodate the microbiology lab equipment room, such an owner requested extra is recognized as a valid use of the public entities authority to request a change such as here where the storage rooms were apparently needed to support a portion of the original scope of work for the Project.

Based on the information reported by the PMO and CPT team at East Los Angeles College, the items making up the subject change order appear consistent with applicable law and the District’s Change Order practice implemented by the Chief Facilities Executive in June 2014.¹

¹ The prior change orders totaled $7,957,529. Adding the $79,916 amount of the change order discussed above, the total change order amount for Contract No. 33801 with Harper Construction Company for the Project will be $8,037,445. There is no cap imposed by the Design-Build statute regarding the number or monetary amount of change orders and the District’s Change Order practice implemented by the Chief Facilities Executive in June 2014 requires that no individual change order can be in an amount that is greater than 10% of the Original Contract Amount and that the extra work must also be either permitted/required by law and/or must be materially related to the original project scope so as to be able to complete the project. The aggregate change order amount of $8,037,445 represents an approximate value of slightly more than 15% of the Original Contract Amount of $52,675,465 and is in compliance with applicable law and the District’s Change Order practice implemented by the Chief Facilities Executive in June 2014. Regarding the prior Change Orders on this Contract, please see Attachment “A” provided by the CPT Team at East LA College.
The Project was fully designed in 2007, released as a DBB 2011, rejected all bids, rebid again as a DBB 2012, placed on Moratorium, converted to a DB, then bid as a DB 2014.

Harper Contract: # 33801
Project Name: ELAC-Science Career & Mathematics Complex (3 buildings)
Project Completion % Total: 76%
Project Completion for Ph 1 (G5 & G7 bldgs only): 97%
Original Contract Amount: $52,675,465 (Ph1 + Ph2)
Change Order Percentage total to Date: 14.84%
G8 & H8 (Ph 2) Change Order Cost: $ 4,317,663 (8.20%)
ADDED Scope-Storm Water Design & Construct Change Order Cost: $2,000,000 (3.8%)
Change Order Percentage w/o G8 & Storm Water: 2.84%

Amendment #1: $1,296,306
Change Orders 1 & 2
Construction Cost: $74,746 + Design Cost: $1,221,560
Unforeseen-Abate and disposal of underground transite (asbestos) piping
Design a new 2-level building to replace the existing G8 & H8 (1963) buildings, previously contracted to be modernized

Amendment #2: $135,112
Change Order 3 & 4
Construction Cost: $123,972+ Design Cost: $11,140
Add a campus southern entrance low voltage loop (security & communication) from the SSRC building to this new G5 building; provide lighting in existing underground utility tunnel in the south roadway; design & construct revisions to the shear wall thickness.

Amendment #3: $3,369,982
Change Orders 5, 6 & 7
Construction Cost: $3,327,392 + Design Cost: $42,590
Construct a new 2-level building to replace the existing G8 & H8 (1963) buildings, previously contracted to be modernized; design & construct a hot water system to supplement demand requirement; design combustion air from roof to boiler; provide additional wall blockouts for pipe penetrations; add curbs in all restrooms & janitor closets for easier maintenance.

Amendment #4: 196,328
Change Order 8 & 9
Construction Cost: $162,168 + Design Cost: $34,160
Provide over-excavation required by the LOR due to duration gap from demo to construction; Add floor poke-through penetration for power/data outlets (25 units); design & install evacuation chair location at exit stair location; provide & install elevator shunt trip breakers.
Amendment #5: $265,108  
Change Order 10  
Construction Cost: $140,236 + Design Cost: $124,872  
Provide and install high performing cabling system with a longer warranty program; design the LEED submittal package for the design portion of the credit, revise the exterior light fixtures to LED models; add sinks & cabinets in new Repertory theory lab.

Amendment #6: $160,752  
Change Order 11  
Construction Cost: $103,138 + Design Cost: $57,614  
Cut & cap an existing utility access manhole hatch; design & construct a mid-rail system (Build-LACCD Bulleting 2015-000) at curtain wall system; re-purpose cadaver room to a micro-biology (growing field) equipment room.

Amendment #7: $99,678  
Change Order 12  
Construction Cost: $76,703 + Design Cost: $22,975  
Repurpose HIT Lab to enlarge Computer Lab; fire rate floor drain penetrations.

Amendment #8: $99,957  
Change Order 13  
Construction Cost: $84,267 + Design Cost: $15,690  
Design and construction structural drift joint connection at curtain wall system and roof pipe/duct penetration supports; construct combustion air from roof to boiler.

Amendment #9: $334,305  
Change Order 14  
Construction Cost: $327,985 + Design Cost: $6,320  
Resequence sprinkler pipe installation to minimize delay while fire sprinkler drawings are pending approval by DSA; add additional card readers; provide a missing diesel filter for owner provided generator.

Amendment #10: $2,000,000  
Change Order 15  
Construction Cost: $1,783,162  + Design Cost: $216,838  
Design & Construct a new storm water system for the west end of the campus in accordance with ELAC Reuse Feasibility Study & District requirements.

[End of Attachment “A”]
Project Assessment #7
July 20, 2016

COMPLETED BY:
STEVEN KISH
Executive Overview

This assessment #7 of the LACCD SIS Modernization project is an interim report on the status of the Financial Aid module. The June 21, 2016 assessment (#6) covered the period from May – June 2016 and also focused on the Financial Aid module. In the May assessment, the Financial Aid module’s status improved from ‘red’ to ‘orange’ status and the June assessment saw continued improvement due to several factors:

1. Consistency of resources on the project (both consulting and LACCD resources).
2. Approval and execution of overtime and weekend hours for the team to catch up on tasks.
3. More dedicated time has led to the FA team being much more comfortable with the software and more confident in their recommendations. The increased confidence is starting to generate better morale.

As of July 20, 2016 the Financial Aid team is on track to complete the following milestones:

1. All configuration for aid year 2016/2017 needed for go live #2 will be completed by the end of July.
2. All development needed for go live #2 is on track to be completed by mid-August.
3. System Integration testing is set to begin on September 26.

Impact and Recommendations

The Financial Aid team has made up a lot of ground and continues to improve with each project assessment. This next period of time will be critical as the team moves into its audit season and continues preparation to enter testing cycles prior to the first go live.

The only recommendation at this time is to continue to monitor the team’s progress as we head into the Fall. It will be difficult to recover if any tasks slip due to the combination of the start of a new school year, audit activity, and the requirements of the SIS project so continued focus will be important to continue the team’s positive momentum.