Dr. Eaton welcomed and thanked the Board members for the time they give to the institution, the students and the employees. She explained the retreat provides the opportunity for the Board to discuss and help set the future direction of the institution and how they bring significant value to the table. She thanked Mr. Steve Eckman, Director of Facilities Planning, and his staff for the preparation they did for this retreat.

Dr. Eaton reviewed the agenda and what staff believed the outcomes of the retreat could be. She explained residential housing was included in the outcomes because when planning for the new student services/classroom building begins, it would be important to know if there would be residential housing in the future, which would impact the function/design of that building. She explained the College is clear on the direction from the Board for the 2013/2014 projects but would need to discuss the prioritization of 2014/2015 projects and beyond.

She shared how many times outside consultants are brought in for retreats and stated the College has inside experts and shared the backgrounds of Mr. Brian Babb, Dr. Michael Vitale, Dr. Tom LoBasso, Mr. Roberto Lombardo, Mrs. Sharon Crow, Ms. Isalene Montgomery, and Mr. Steve Eckman.

Mr. Lewis explained as the Board Chair he has the opportunity to meet and work with those staff and is more impressed every day with quality of work and quality of people
that represent the Board and the institution. Mr. Lewis shared how outside people have spoken highly of Mr. Eckman and felt confident the people that head up the institution are qualified and caring individuals. He appreciated the Board members’ commitment to the College and for attending the retreat. He shared how important it is if the Board has questions or does not understand something that they can get the answers so they can make good and confident votes. He felt it was important for the Board to understand and to have input on the master site planning process.

Mr. Eckman reviewed the assumptions listed below and explained they are tied to the discussion points:

**Assumptions:**
1. Prepare our facilities to meet the requirements of a 21st century college
2. Determine a reasonable “maximum” capacity of all sites
3. Enrollment growth stabilizes
4. Limited funding
5. Focus on oldest/least efficient buildings
6. Follow good campus design guidelines

**Discussion Points:**
1. **What does the 21st century campus look like?**

   **Library/ASC/Writing Centers**
   Dr. Vitale spoke on how libraries have evolved over the years and information is becoming digital which is being driven by technology. Mr. Lombardo added that many of the books in libraries are being transferred to digital content and how group collaboration provides more information for the students. He shared library space is still very important as learning areas and group collaborations but pointed out that technology and wireless connectivity can be difficult to incorporate into older buildings. Mrs. Hosseini shared how libraries are selling points for universities and are large open areas that offer comfortable seating, tech support and a coffee shop and would like to see that for the College.

   Dr. Vitale shared libraries are currently only on the Daytona and DeLand campuses. Mr. Lewis shared because of technology requirements there will be increased costs for new structures in preparing for the 21st century.

   Mr. Freckleton was interested in the safety of the infrastructure and Mr. Lombardo shared what the institution has in place to protect its systems.

   **Learning Styles/Online Instruction/New Instructional Technologies**
   Mr. Eckman shared the learning style is very different for the younger generation. Dr. Vitale stated the traditional lecture format is going away and younger students have developed skills that older students do not have. With the changes in learning styles this will affect classroom set up, the library and online instruction. He shared many students who take online courses utilize the computers on campus for these courses. Access to computers and support
would need to be considered if residence halls were to be done. Mr. Lombardo has staff looking into new instructional technology, furniture that can be mobile, and power sources around the perimeter of the room. Mr. Eckman shared one of the older classrooms may be converted into what a modern classroom would look like and would see how instructors and students react to it. This design can be used as a guideline for the new building on the Flagler/Palm Coast site.

Dr. Eaton mentioned a discussion with Follett bookstores about e-books and Mr. Lombardo believed this area is not moving forward as quickly because the publishers are not ready.

**New Career Choices**
Dr. Vitale shared careers are evolving and becoming high tech and the career choices are unlimited and felt that in the future there will not be the same choices graduates have today. Discussed the importance of certificate programs and the opportunities of those taking the engineering baccalaureate degree.

**Campus Life/Athletics/Cultural Activities**
Dr. LoBasso shared there are studies that tie campus life to student success and how there is a fine balance between high tech and high touch. People like to talk to other people and throughout the education process there needs to be people to speak with. He shared the personal relationships students develop at the College help with retention. Athletic and cultural activities are part of campus life and the Student Activities department works to bring students together at various events. Studies show that students living in residence halls are more connected to their institution, do better academically, and tend to give more back after graduating.

Mr. Lewis commented that talking about curriculum and campus life will lead into making a better master plan and when it is put together the Board can understand the dynamics that are at work and how they are tied together.

2. **Review capacities and usage of all sites**
Mr. Eckman explained it is necessary to determine the reasonable maximum capacity of all sites and how there are many factors to discuss which are:

- *Height Limitations* – Multi-level buildings would work on the Daytona campus but would be out of place at another site.
- *Storm Water Retention* – When looking at each site the College has to address capturing water and treating it before it leaves the campus, incorporate retention areas into the design.
- *Wetlands* – Some sites have wetlands and each site has different environmental issues that have to be dealt with.
- *Funding “sweet spot”* – Easier to receive funding from the legislature when project costs are lower so staff looks at buildings that are large enough to
meet the need but small enough to get funded. Smaller buildings are more costly per square foot.

- Roadway/Parking/Sidewalks – Getting students to the campus, getting parked and then to their classes. Discussed public transportation available at the various sites.

- Site usage – Enrollment will level off and upper division enrollment continues to grow and discussed enrollment and size of the regional campus sites and demographic data projections.

  - DeLand Campus - second largest site with 2,700 students, eight buildings, on 103 acres.
  - Deltona Center - 1,300 students, one building and 13 portables, on 100 acres, Deltona is the largest city in Volusia County. It was noted that this campus is in close proximity to another college and loses students from area high schools to that institution.
  - New Smyrna Beach/Edgewater Center - has 900 students, two buildings on 93 acres.
  - Flagler/Palm Coast Center - has 1600 students and one permanent building on 100 acres. A second building is scheduled for construction.

The Bachelor of Applied Science program has begun to be offered at the Deltona site. Also mentioned SunRail is under construction and will be in Debary which is adjacent to Deltona and could impact the growth of this area. Suggested meetings with the cities to find out where they will be focusing their economic growth. Dr. Eaton explained staff has met with the Mayor and City Manager of Deltona and each regional site director has responsibility to meet with the local economic development and political leaders for their areas and to stay abreast of changes or needs.

Discussed campus life and how the DeLand Campus offers a variety of services and Deltona could also be this way if expanded. Discussed new program implementation and shifting of enrollment between campuses. Staff work closely to be efficient in scheduling classes between these two sites because of their close proximity to one another and most students prefer to stay on one campus. The distance between the two campuses is around eight miles and discussed why the Deltona site was developed. Discussed having a cost analysis done for the DeLand and Deltona sites; the possibility of looking at two sites as one campus and each offering its own specific programs; transportation between sites; and scheduling of classes so students could have enough time to travel between sites to attend classes. It was noted that until an interchange was built it was difficult traveling between the two sites.
Discussed the parking need at the Flagler/Palm Coast site and the idea of expanding the DeLand Campus and not having a center in Deltona. Suggested collecting data to determine if Deltona students would attend classes in DeLand. There was discussion on the importance of the College’s presence in Deltona, as the center is adjacent to City Hall and would need to look at the impact to that community if there was no longer a site there. Mr. Eckman explained the DeLand Campus has at least twenty buildable acres on its site.

Mr. Lewis adjourned the retreat at 9:45 a.m. for a brief break. The retreat resumed at 10:05 a.m.

Mr. Eckman shared the history of the acquisition of state land for the Deltona campus and how it is restricted for educational use only. He explained when the site was first developed there was an interchange on I-4 that did not exist which made traveling between these campuses difficult. There are state guidelines on when a site can move from a center designation (under 1,000 FTE) to a campus designation (over 1,000 FTE) and how library or athletic space can only be built on a campus.

Discussed the development of the building on the Flagler/Palm Coast site and what could be incorporated into this building since it does not have the campus designation.

3. Enrollment
Mr. Eckman shared there were issues that would need to be addressed with regards to the impact of online courses, dual enrollment, adult education, vocational education and bachelors programs. Discussed the Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree and if the College offered it where it would be located on the campus. The history of the College’s enrollment was reviewed.

4. Discussion of funding
Mr. Eckman explained the facilities planning process begins with the reporting of enrollment and inventory to Tallahassee three times a year. Tallahassee then projects how they see the College growing in the future. These enrollment projections are used to develop the 5-Year Survey of Need which are then calculated into student stations, square footage, projects and then finally into buildings.

He shared the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which is done annually, takes the highest need from the 5-Year Survey of Need and is put forward to Tallahassee for funding. Once the project receives funding, construction can begin. The 5-Year Survey and the CIP are presented to the Board for approval. He shared the final step in developing the 5-Year Survey of Need is the development of the Master Site Plan which takes all of the needs and incorporates them into all of the sites.
Mr. Eckman shared funding for capital projects comes from Postsecondary Education and Capital Outlay (PECO) which is a tax on utilities and this revenue is bonded. This amount of funding is then split among K-12, the college system, and the university system. He shared there is quite a lot of competition for funding and how important it is to have everything in order.

5. Residential housing
Mr. Eckman indicated the staff would like input from the Board on if this was something they would like to pursue. Mr. Freckleton felt it would be prudent to plan for it, where they would be located, but did not need to discuss funding at this point since they would like to find out if students want it.

Mrs. Hosseini would like to know how many of the 28 colleges have attempted student housing, if they have been successful and where they received their funding. She was unsure if it was a good idea or not but shared whatever makes the lives of the students better is a good idea.

Dr. LoBasso explained a questionnaire about residence halls/dormitories was sent to the each of the colleges’ chief business officers in April 2012 and responses showed five of the colleges have on campus housing. Dr. Eaton shared she also contacted the college presidents to get their perspective.

*Distributed Residence Halls and Dormitory Questionnaire. Made an official part of the minutes as Supplemental A: 9/7/12.*

Mr. Eckman shared there are no current avenues for any state college to show a need for student housing which is why a project like this would have to be funded by a third party. He shared Edison College had recently completed residential housing which started with their board and president agreeing they needed housing, moved forward with developing a third party corporation. He stated the college’s trustees and foundation board members serve on this corporation. The corporation borrowed funding, hired the developer to construct the facility, and hired additional staff. He said they plan to manage the facility for the first year and then may hire a firm to take on this responsibility. Edison has built 400 beds in phase one and the pro forma indicates they are at 80% capacity in the first semester and the breakeven point is 87%. He visited the facility and commented how nice it is and described the facilities and how each has their own kitchenette, washer/dryer and are within walking distance to classrooms. The Board members were very impressed with Edison’s facility.

Discussed the Whisper Oaks property where athletes are currently housed and what would happen to this facility because of the contractual obligation to the Foundation.
Mrs. Hosseini shared on a positive note if the project did move forward the cost of construction is much less than it was five years ago.

Mr. Lewis explained there would need to be discussion on where it should be located on the campus. He was concerned with taking up all of the green space. Mrs. Hosseini felt the campus could be more attractive if planned accordingly and having a beautiful, open campus and nice places for students to gather is something the students would be proud of.

Discussed the location of the multi-purpose field and tennis courts, and the layout of the parking lots. Mr. Eckman reviewed the eight buildings that were being focused on because of their age.

Mr. Freckleton asked if any of the current students were surveyed on housing and if a more recent survey could be conducted. Dr. LoBasso explained a survey was done a couple of years ago and was looking for direction from the Board if they wanted to do housing and if so where. Dr. Eaton shared they can do a survey but felt when the question is asked it could set the expectation that housing might be done and was hoping to hear from the Board on if this was something the College should begin to explore.

Mrs. Haas asked about the responsibilities the College or a third party would have with regards to finance, construction and management if this moved forward. Dr. LoBasso explained the role of the third party would need to be determined and Mr. Eckman stated no funding would be used by the College or could be intermingled and referred back to Edison’s arrangement. Mr. Babb shared it is all subject to negotiations and Mrs. Hosseini concurred and said it was all about how good one can negotiate.

**Good Campus Design**

Mr. Eckman shared the ideal master plan is to start with a blank slate but since this is not the case they have tried to develop a loop road around the campus and once students enter the core of the campus it is pedestrian traffic only. Dr. Recascino suggested the loop road encompassing the buildings on International Speedway Blvd. Mr. Davis shared this is something that can be planned for the future and Mrs. Haas felt once changes are put in place the campus will be more useful for many decades to come. Mr. Freckleton commented that a developer could be asked to incorporate enhancements into the campus also.

Mrs. Hosseini discussed the idea of utilizing a new planner which could offer new, fresh, or a different vision rather than the same people that have been used over many years.
6. **Review and discussion of Master Site Plan**  

**CIP Summary**  
Mr. Eckman reviewed the current CIP plan which includes renovations, remodeled, new construction and funds for land acquisition. Reviewed the prioritization of projects and the funding request and what was received. Discussed funding for the remodel of the Theater Center in 2013/2014 and how there were no assurances this would be funded.

**Prioritization of 2014/15 Projects**  
Mr. Eckman shared the Flagler/Palm Coast construction project will be completed and will not require funding in 2014/15; the Theater Center remodel will need some additional funding; and would look further at Deltona to determine if this is what is needed. Discussed the renovations of Building 520 and Building 5 on the DeLand Campus and how they hope to expand the life of the building for another 15 years by renovating them.

Dr. Eaton asked if the Board felt priority 6 was okay where it was. Mr. Eckman indicated this item will help staff develop and make parking improvements on all sites. No revision to the ranking was made. Dr. Eaton explained the priority of projects for 2014/2015 seemed reasonable as is and there would be work needed with regards to the Deltona project.

Mrs. Hosseini felt the College should ask for increased funding in 2014/2015 because not all will be funded and would be fortunate to receive half of what was being asked for. Mrs. Crow discussed PECO funding.

Dr. Eaton was not sure of the Board’s direction on housing and Mr. Lewis indicated the Board would like a business plan that would address all of the Board’s input. He shared everyone is supportive of the idea of student housing but they need to have a business plan before they can move forward. Dr. Eaton confirmed the Board was supportive of moving forward with the exploration of student housing.

Discussed developers for student housing and keeping the Board informed once the selection process begins. Mr. Babb indicated he would gather financing opportunities from other legal counselors. Mr. Lewis felt when data is gathered the Board may need another retreat to review and discuss all the details.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Eckman to explain where they are on the Flagler/Palm Coast project and to explain about the selection process. Mr. Eckman stated funding was received in July and began the process for selecting the design team. He shared there is a statute that determines how design professionals are selected and the College policy and procedures follow the statute. He explained the announcement is advertised publicly; proposals are received and reviewed by a committee who then narrows to the top three firms. Background checks are performed and the three top firms are invited to come in and make a presentation.
to the committee. The committee ranks the firms and the ranking is presented to the President for approval by the Board. The fees are then negotiated with the top ranked firm and will be brought to the Board for approval.

He explained they have just begun the process for selection of the construction manager and how this is advertised to firms that have been prequalified as contractors for the College, proposals are received and reviewed by a committee who then narrows to the top three firms. Background checks are performed and the three top firms are invited to come in and make a presentation to the committee. The committee ranks the firms and the ranking is presented to the President for approval by the Board. The fees are then negotiated with the top ranked firm and will be brought to the Board for approval.

He shared construction management at risk is a different delivery method of how a project is designed and constructed. The College began using this method when the Advanced Technology College was being constructed. He described how a general contractor is brought in from the beginning to help with design process and to help the architect to determine the best method for constructing the building. The general contractor will also provide the College with cost estimates for the project. The College would typically pay a 1% fee of the overall cost for this service for a building the size of the one being constructed on the Flagler/Palm Coast center. He explained the College has the option in the contract to sever ties with the construction manager at the end of the design phase and bid out the project if it desires. If the College does not sever ties, they would then meet with the construction manager to negotiate their costs/profits, which could be around 8%. The College then works with the construction manager who competitively bids out the project. The construction manager helps the College review the companies to ensure they get quality companies and oversee all of the construction. He shared there are other methods out there and are looking at the design/build method for the thermal storage facility.

Mr. Lewis commented how important it is for the architect and contractor to work together on a building. He asked what is brought forward for Board approval and Dr. Eaton clarified the committee would narrow down the proposals to the top three firms and bring the ranking to the Board for approval. Mr. Babb explained the committee conducts the interviews, does the ranking and the due diligence.

Mrs. Hosseini inquired if they used a criteria sheet for ranking and if price was a factor. Mr. Eckman explained they do use a scoring matrix and are not allowed to discuss price until they begin negotiations with the number one ranked firm. Should they fail to come to an agreement with the number one ranked firm, they are then allowed to talk to the second ranked firm. He explained all of the documents are public records. Mrs. Hosseini clarified her understanding of the process and asked if contractors know who is on the committee. Dr. Vitale shared firms do not know who are on the committee until they come in for the interview and Mr. Babb explained instruction is given to the employees not to
communicate with proposed vendors. Dr. Recascino asked if the committee is queried for any types of conflicts of interest and Mr. Eckman said they are. Mr. Eckman explained questions submitted by vendors and responses to the questions are posted to the website so all have the same information when working on the proposals.

Dr. Recascino clarified what is presented to the Board and asked if they would receive renderings. Dr. Eaton indicated the names of the firms are what is presented to the Board for approval. Dr. LoBasso explained the committee sees the projects they have designed and looks at this information during the process. Mr. Babb explained the Florida Administrative Code states anything above $325,000 comes to the Board on the recommendation of the President to approve or reject the list in its entirety.

Mrs. Haas suggested the Board receive a copy of the scoring matrix so they have more knowledge on what they are voting on. Dr. Recascino felt a one page summary that included information about the company that included when it was established, the score it received would be helpful to the Board.

Mrs. Hosseini felt Florida law puts pressure on the employees to determine if the information given to them in the proposals are accurate. Mr. Freckleton stated the Board should have confidence in the committee to bring information to the Board and if is not right then it is addressed with the committee. Mrs. Holness suggested asking about projects being completed and on time. She said it was important to ask the right questions to gather the right data.

Mr. Eckman explained they ask for the qualifications of the team members who will be working on the College’s project. They look at buildings they have done in the past and if they are similar based on dollar value, building type (education or office) and will give more credit for those closer to the College’s criteria. He shared they take the top three firms and call the owners of at least two projects and if it is an architect they call the contractor and vice versa. They ask questions such as was it on time, on budget, were there a lot of change orders, and how did you like the design.

Mrs. Haas stated how some companies may be upset if they were not selected and could claim the process may not have been done properly. She shared if the Board has additional information it would help when voting on these items. Mr. Babb shared about the handling of bid protests and how this is addressed before being presented to the Board.

Mrs. Hosseini explained it would be helpful to know how many times a company/owner has been sued and stated there are ways companies can get around answering questions. Mr. Eckman shared this is done and they do check backgrounds of the companies.
Mrs. Holness suggested the committee start with an overall consensus and take the extra step to come together and talk about the project before beginning the process.

Mr. Lewis thanked everyone for their input and questions and how helpful it is for them to know what has been done before it is presented to the Board.

Retreat adjourned at 12:23 p.m.