

The logo for T'NT CONSULTANTS features a black horizontal bar with the company name in white, bold, sans-serif capital letters. To the left of the bar, there are three overlapping squares: a red one on top, a blue one on the left, and a yellow one on the bottom. A thin black vertical line intersects the squares and the bar.

**T'NT CONSULTANTS**

## **Lane Community College**

### **Bond Project Criteria Development April 2008**

**Submitted by:  
T'NT Consultants  
April 11, 2008  
Process Overview**

999 Brookside Drive  
Eugene, OR 97405  
541-345-5091 phone/fax  
541-913-4884 cell  
eggt@comcast.net

## **Introduction**

LCC is undertaking a process to prioritize projects for inclusion in a potential bond measure. T'NT Consultants was contracted to assist a committee to develop criteria by which projects can be evaluated. The Criteria Development Committee's work was completed April 11, 2008 and the tools developed were passed forward to the Applications Group. See Attachment A Criteria Tool: Projects, Attachment B Criteria Tool: Bundles, and Attachment C Supporting Information.

The Applications Group is charged with applying the criteria to the list of projects under consideration and recommending a finite group that could be bond financed. Their conclusions will be forwarded to the Office of the President for further revision and presentation to the Board of Directors.

## **The Criteria Development Committee**

Jonathan Morton  
Barb Delansky  
Josh Canaday  
Bob Baldwin  
Don McNair  
Margaret Robertson  
Tamara Pinkas  
Lida Herburger  
Marcia Bell  
Bob Mention  
David Willis  
Tracy Simms  
Kate Barry  
Craig Taylor  
Larry Scott  
Andrea Newton  
Ellen Teninty, T'NT Consultants Principal  
Chris Watchie, T'NT Consultants Associate  
Julie Fischer, T'NT Consultants Associate

## **Criteria Development Process**

The Criteria Development Committee met for four hours each on April 4 and April 7, 2008. At the first meeting, the committee was briefed on building projects and program options under consideration. The consultants then presented a draft list of criteria culled from campus documents such as the LCC Core Values, the Long-Range Strategic Campus Plan and the Learning Plan. These criteria were revised, their intended meanings defined, and data needs were identified at the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

At the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, the committee reviewed and edited their work and began the process of identifying high priorities, especially those which “trump” other criteria or are considered essential. The committee was able to focus discussion effectively to generally prioritize and condense criteria after an exercise that revealed the sense of the room.

The Criteria Development Committee then tested the criteria tool by seeing if the developed criteria were workable for two projects from the list. This trouble-shooting exercise allowed the group to revise the tool further, and realize the inter-related complexities of the projects on the list and the challenges of getting adequate data within the timeframe. At the end of this exercise, the committee suggested that the Applications Group evaluate packages of projects, not only individual projects. Bob Mention agreed to develop groupings of projects that work together and fit within the funding constraints for consideration by the Applications Group.

## **How to use this tool**

The goal of the criteria tool and supporting document is to give LCC a framework for evaluating projects and programs for inclusion in the 2008 bond measure. The criteria make the comparison of projects more consistent, give the group a shared language for the discussion, and help to provide a consistent explanation of the results to others.

Step 1: Read the supporting document, which includes descriptions of the criteria as well as data needed to apply them to the projects. Make sure that everyone has the same understanding of the intention of each criterion. This supporting document can evolve over time as each step in the decision-making process occurs. For example, the data needs listed in this document are incomplete and represent specific suggestions made by the Criteria Development Committee. It is fully expected that the Application Group will fill in the data that they can.

Step 2: Use the criteria tool to apply each criterion to potential bond projects. Use the color-coded key to fill in the blanks. We have provided two variations of the tool: one lists all the projects under consideration and a second where projects can be considered in bundles. The application exercise can be done as a group, or done individually first and then discussed to reach consensus about the appropriate ratings.

Since the criteria tool was developed to evaluate projects individually and there is value to understanding each project's merits, we suggest that the Applications Committee begin by applying the tool to each specific project and move to Step 3. Then have Bob Mention explain the pros and cons of the different project bundles to understand their inter-relationships and the trade-offs they represent and try to use the criteria tool to evaluate the project bundles. Since we did not test the tool on groups of projects, it is difficult to foresee what challenges will

arise. It is possible and acceptable to add criteria that emerge as needed for this task.

Step 3: Interpret the results of the evaluation process. Look at the tool once it is filled in by the group. The Criteria Development Committee identified eight high priority criteria that are indicated by an asterisk and listed first in the criteria tool and the supporting document. Beyond the “high priority” distinction, they are not prioritized. Projects which have received many positives (green) in high priority criteria (asterisked criterion on top part of tool) have received a high rating. However, please remember that all criteria listed are important to the Criteria Development Committee and should be taken in consideration in any recommendation.

Step 4: Evaluate the effectiveness of the criteria and consider revising if needed. Our goal is to begin a dynamic and accountable process, not to introduce a static tool that cannot improve and evolve. We strongly recommend that LCC document changes to the criteria and share the results with the Criteria Development Committee and any others involved in the decision-making process. Clarity of process will help students, staff, and the broader community to understand, appreciate, and support the final outcome.

#### Assumptions

The committee discussed including criteria that eventually became assumptions for all the projects. For example, “Supports innovation” was a criterion the group considered, but did not include on the list since it is an LCC Core Value that can be assumed for all projects. If two projects were equal, they could be compared by which was more innovative. “Supports sustainability goals,” while also a Core Value, is included as a criterion with definition for how to use it beyond the campus commitment to LEED Silver Green Building Standards. Another criterion that became an assumption for all projects is that they need to comply with building codes and regulations, including ADA compliance and beyond.

#### Data

It was recognized that the tight timeframe is a challenge to have complete data available for the Applications Group. The uneven availability of data may impact the ability to apply the criteria in a uniform way. It was agreed that qualitative data was also to be used along with quantitative data, especially due to the timeframe available. For example, if the college cannot conduct a poll of what will “improve student quality of life” campus student leaders could be interviewed as one source of data considered, in addition to existing quantitative research on that topic.

Some data needs are identified for criteria in the supporting document, though some overarching data needs emerged and are listed at the end of the supporting document, such as:

- Are there phasing needs?

- What are the ripple effects of doing a project?
- Are there necessary project linkages?
- Will doing the project eliminate beneficial space and how could that be addressed?
- What is estimated time to completion and when will it have capacity to generate revenue?
- What are the existing utilization rates and what will be future utilization rates?

As the Applications Group does its work, it would be useful to catalogue additional assumptions and additional overarching data needs.

## **Observations**

The basis of the process begins with the project list. The project list evolved over several years and was discussed in a number of venues. It will not be final until the Board of Education makes a decision about which projects are to be included in the bond measure.

The consultants were asked to facilitate the Criteria Development Committee, but were not involved in thinking through whether that group would be perceived as representative of all interests. For example, faculty see themselves as representing the interests of the students to whom they have dedicated their work lives, yet the students in the room believe that only students can represent certain aspects of the student experience and therefore need to be included. In this case, students were present, but it is likely that there are other groups who believe their inclusion at the table would have enhanced the resulting product.

A fundamental principle of public participation is to report back how input was used. As this process moves forward, hopefully to the passage of a bond measure, it will help to build trust and support on campus if those taking the next steps can document and share their thinking and decisions with those involved in the earlier stages. In addition, it will help others to support the decisions if they can see and understand the data used to apply the criteria. It is more work in an environment of shrinking resources, but the payoff is integrity.



Attachment B						
RATING: Positive Neutral Negative Don't Know Does not apply	Bundle #1	Bundle #2	Bundle #3	Bundle #4		
						
Enhances student engagement and learning *						
Aligns with current research in education*						
Helps bond pass *						
Protects college assets *						
Has maximum positive or minimal negative impact on operating budget over time *						
Optimizes design and use of existing space *						
Insures adequate infrastructure capability and capacity *						
Supports sustainability goals *						
Supports campus diversity and serves demographic population trends						
Improves student quality of life						
Helps students build student community						
Addresses unsafe conditions						
Addresses substandard working conditions						
Builds LCC relationships with community						
Promotes universal physical access						
Contributes funding resources						
Helps faculty and staff build community						
Security compliance to national higher education standards and trends						
Supports diversity of programs						
<i>* Denotes highest priority criteria. While all of the criteria are important, the Criteria Development Committee identified the highest priority criteria by consensus by on 4/7/08. The criteria are not in sequential order of priority.</i>						

Attachment C: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING BOND PROJECTS

4/11/08

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTIVE NOTES	DATA
Enhances student engagement and learning *	e.g. natural light	
Aligns with current research in education *	How lectures are delivered, cooperative learning, on-line learning	What are the various trends?
Helps bond pass *	<p>Voter approval – consider how bond proposal meshes with marketing concept of “renewal”</p> <p>Reflects community input – include students in definition of community</p>	<p>Polling, business &amp; community leaders meetings</p> <p>Forums, focus groups, Community Conversations, Advisory Committees</p> <p>How does project impact affordability or availability of LLC education?</p>
Protects college assets *	Relating to infrastructure (e.g. roof conditions)	
Has maximum positive or minimal negative impact on operating budget over time *	<p>Positive impacts: Generates additional revenue such as FTE, state reimbursements, tuition, retail, fees</p> <p>Negative impacts: Staffing needed for building and programs. Data not available for project life-cycle costs.</p>	<p>What are the potential additional revenue sources and how certain are they?</p> <p>What are the unfunded staffing implications of projects?</p>
Optimizes design and use of existing space *	<p>Creates flexible space: Adaptable to changing program needs</p> <p>Is feasible for multiple uses: Can accommodate integrated programs e.g. a recycling center where classes are taught and is a community demonstration project</p> <p>Is in the best location, based on current options</p> <p>Creates support space for programs (e.g. storage)</p>	What are the trade- offs? Does it eliminate beneficial space?
Insures adequate infrastructure capability and capacity *	Impact on utility load, etc.	
Supports sustainability goals *	<p>Includes ecological, social, and economic systems as defined in LCC core values</p> <p>Include impact of programs and changes to infrastructure, e.g. maintenance upgrades.</p>	Which projects contribute the most to the sustainability goals of LCC?

Note: \* Denotes highest priority criteria. While all of the criteria are important, the Criteria Development Committee identified the highest priority criteria by consensus by on 4/7/08. The criteria are not in sequential order of priority. Information in the “Data” column requires further development.

Attachment C: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING BOND PROJECTS

4/11/08

Supports campus diversity and serves demographic population trends	Diversity of staff, students, and community Population trends for LCC	Age, gender, language, market potential, geography
Improves student quality of life	e.g. Learning spaces outside of classroom	Information on student non-classroom needs
Helps students build student community	e.g. Large enough spaces to gather	What else does this mean?
Addresses unsafe conditions		
Addresses substandard working conditions	Air quality, natural lighting, adequate space	
Builds LCC relationships with community	Outreach and partnership with community	
Promotes universal physical access	Meets and exceeds ADA requirements	Where are the major accessibility problems?
Contributes funding resources	e.g. Bookstore	
Helps faculty and staff build community		
Security compliance to national higher education standards and trends		
Supports diversity of programs	Serves the college mission of being a comprehensive community college	
		Overall data needs: What are the phasing needs? What are the ripple effects? Are there necessary project linkages (for instance, can't do Project A, if you don't do Project B)

*Note: \* Denotes highest priority criteria. While all of the criteria are important, the Criteria Development Committee identified the highest priority criteria by consensus by on 4/7/08. The criteria are not in sequential order of priority. Information in the "Data" column requires further development.*