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Issue

As a part of their community outreach colleges and universities typically make selected facilities such as stadiums, theaters, playing fields and classrooms available to outside groups. Often facilities are leased for events with rental fees charged to reimburse for costs of maintenance, upkeep and repairs (MUR). In some instances rentals provide for service or overhead charges which yield revenue to the campus and its various programs and in some cases to the venue concerned. To facilitate the process and to encourage rentals, many institutions have established offices which serve as the interface between the user, which may include on-campus co-sponsors, and the campus offices which play regulatory and service roles in the leasing/licensing process necessary for various kinds of events.

Despite its size, CSU Fullerton lacks a program or office which serves as the point of focus for facilities use coordination although certain elements which might be subsumed under such a program or office do exist.

The purpose of this report is to examine the dimensions of the need to establish an office or program dedicated to facilities use coordination and to propose a strategy of moving forward in the most economical and efficient manner.

Organization of the Report

The report is organized into five sections:

- A summary of the current campus approach to facilities use and coordination based on a review of various reports, memoranda and interviews of campus staff.
- Summary of practices and policies at selected CSU campuses.
- Considerations raised in the course of the review.
- Discussion of value of campus-wide facilities use coordination.
- Proposed steps toward establishing a coordinated program.

I. The Current Approach

The campus facilities use practices are currently guided by policies set forth in the October 1988 Facility Use Manual. This is a comprehensive document which was, apparently, the result
of extensive consultation before its approval by the President. It replaced a 1979 Executive Order. The Manual has been the subject of a limited number of amendments, the most recent appears to be in 1994.

An effort to streamline the Manual was undertaken in 2000 with a draft statement entitled University Facility Scheduling and Use going forward to the President’s Administrative Board (PAB) in December 2000. This statement called for combining academic scheduling with facilities use coordination in a campus events office reporting to Administration and Finance. Apparently due to budgetary issues, major aspects of the statement were not implemented, although the concept was endorsed by PAB in January 2001.

The summary of the then current status accompanying the proposal in 2000 reads as follows describing the situation which is much as it continues until today:

The current facilities management plan divides university buildings and grounds into at least 11 types of “venues.” The President has delegated authority to schedule these venues among 11 different offices/coordinators and assigned administrative responsibility among 11 different administrators. Several other campus departments within the Vice President for Administration’s Division must review and approve the proposed uses of these facilities; however the Vice President for Administration has no direct authority to schedule events in, or any administrative responsibility for, any venue under the current plan. There is no one office setting policy and procedural direction concerning the use of campus facilities. The number of individuals/offices with authority to schedule and/or administer an aspect of the university’s facilities has also made the establishment of a “master events” calendar very difficult. (Beisner to Hagan, Palmer and Barrett, 12/13/00.)

This is not to say that a degree of coordination of facilities use has not occurred. In 1980 a Coordinator of University Facilities/Insurance and Facilities Use Officer (Martin Carbone) was appointed who served as a point person for facilities use requests, reporting to the Vice President for Administration. It was in the 80’s that the comprehensive facilities use manual was compiled and distributed. However, in 2001 that person was reassigned to other responsibilities and subsequently retired. The responsibility for coordination then fell to the Director of Risk Management (John Beisner). Subsequently, in 2003 the function and responsibilities of the Facilities Use Officer were assigned to Facilities Management. However, no staff is designated to perform a coordinator role at present.

Discussion began once more in 2007 regarding the need for greater coordination which led to drafting of a description in early 2009 for a position to head a Facilities Use Office. Ultimately, Vice President Hagan issued a call for nominations for a staff reassignment to fulfill the function since budgetary issues prohibited establishment of a new baseline position. However, a staff member was not identified for assignment.
At the present time, informal coordination arrangements are the case with no single area or administrator clearly responsible, though history and previous delegations suggest that the Vice President for Administration and Finance is responsible, acting for the President in this area. The basic operational aspects of facilities use are being addressed, i.e., the preparation of contracts, general oversight of calendaring use of facilities, collection of fees, etc. What has not occurred in a consistent fashion is the marketing of available facilities, establishment of campus-wide, uniform fee schedules, provision of basic information regarding rentals on the campus web site, and development of a master calendar.

II. Practices and Policies at Selected Campuses

A search of web sites of CSU campuses in the Los Angeles area yields information of varying detail regarding facility use policies and information regarding rental by outside groups. (Northridge, Dominguez Hills, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Pomona, San Bernardino, San Diego) In contrast, the CSU Fullerton web site provides no campus-wide information regarding facilities use. Searching for athletic facility rentals, however, yields descriptions of various athletic facilities and contact information for rentals. Similarly, the Titan Student Union site yields information regarding conference spaces available for rental as is the case regarding the Golleher Alumni House and the Fullerton Arboretum.

Three neighboring campus programs are summarized for illustrative purposes:

CSU Los Angeles

Initial Point of contact: Office of Public Affairs. Referral for outside groups to Facility Use Coordinator.

Staff: Facility Use Coordinator. (Responsible for the coordination of all requests by off-campus groups for use of University facilities. The Facility Use Coordinator is responsible for the preparation of the Lease by Campus President, securing a certificate of insurance, and other materials associated with the use of University facilities.) Major venues have designated Facility Managers.

Reporting line: Vice President for Administration

Standing campus coordinating committee: Yes. Chaired by Facility Use Coordinator.

Responsibility: All open spaces including athletics and meeting rooms. Luckman theater, student union, housing and child care center not included. (Luckman gives priority to rentals over campus instruction.)

Fee schedule: Yes.
Rental income: Deposited into university fund to cover MUR; no guaranteed percentage to venue.

Master calendar: Yes, but manual. Coordinated with Public Affairs calendar of events.

Priority for Use: Yes. Instructional use ranked first.

Web site information: Copy of administrative procedure on web site. Venue coordinators are identified. Specific TV/film directions not shown.

Issues/comment: Departments agreeing to rentals independent of Facility Use office noted as an issue. Importance of campus committee underscored.

CSPU, Pomona

Initial Point of Contact: Use & License of Facilities Coordinator

Staff: Use and License of Facilities Coordinator

Reporting line: University Advancement, University Events office

Standing Campus Coordinating Committee: Yes

Responsibility: All campus spaces are eligible for rental subject to availability. Associated Students and foundation facilities not included.

Fee schedule: Yes.

Rental income: 18% surcharge to cover costs of office. After expenses residual given to venue concerned. Object is to avoid costs to venue. Receipts in the $300,000-350,000 range. Rates are reviewed once a year. Campus facilities management has formula used to calculate MUR charges.

Master Calendar: No. Coordinator calls around to different venue managers.

Priority for use: Top priority to instruction.

Web Information: Information found under Advancement site. List and photos of available venues. Contact information listed. Best site of group.

Issues/coordination: Acceptance of policies result of year-long committee study. Location in Advancement can lead to increased work load for coordinator when called on to help on major campus events.
CSU Dominguez Hills

Initial Point of Contact: Office of Procurement

Staff: Facilities Leasing and Scheduling Coordinator

Reporting Line: Vice President for Administration and Finance/Director of Procurement

Standing Coordinating Committee: Yes

Responsibility: All university space including athletics and extended education; student union, housing exceptions.

Fee schedule: Yes

Rental income: Devoted to MUR costs in areas concerned. Some built-in overhead.

Master calendar: Currently maintained through PeopleSoft. Considered unsatisfactory. Plan to replace when funds permit.

Priority for use: Scheduled instruction though under some circumstances a class may be displaced.

Web site information: Information on leasing and contact references relatively easily found on web site. (Web site continues to include statements from the previous president!)

Issues/comment: The policy regarding encompassing all facilities has been in place for many years and is not a subject of controversy. CSUDH procedures include this statement:

“It is a process goal of these procedures to limit the number of points of contacts the client must make with campus personnel in order to enter into facilities lease agreements.”

Other cases


Northridge: University Licensing for external clients housed in University Corporation office. Material on web site.

San Bernardino: Decentralized venue reservations
San Diego: Decentralized scheduling. Student Life, for example, controls campus grounds. Classrooms for use by external groups by Business Services; on campus groups through Academic Affairs; athletic facilities through Business Services. Policy clear and up-to-date.

III. Considerations Raised in Course of Study

If it ain’t broke . . .

In the course of the review few examples were cited by interviewees where it was clear that the system had broken down. The current informal coordination of facilities use seems to have been working in most instances: licenses are issued, insurance assured, contracts written and fees collected. The fact that the campus has functioned over a decade without any sort of facilities use office, and never with a campus events office, could support the argument not to move forward with a new program even apart from the present budget climate.

Efforts to coordinate processes and procedures which have been working apparently satisfactorily can be viewed as unnecessary centralization. Responsibility for the care and use of facilities, it can be argued, should not be removed from the level which has the greatest stake in the use of the facilities. Decisions at the lowest level it can be asserted lead to greater awareness of the value of the facilities entrusted to a faculty member or academic department’s care. Though the point may be most obvious in the case of a science laboratory containing sensitive equipment or a brand new building, it can be made as well regarding classrooms, particularly those equipped with the latest technologies.

On the other hand, an excerpt from the Leadership and Development Task Force report on Current Marketing and Trade Agreements of May 2009 to PAB speaks to the point regarding a decentralized environment:

“. . . There are numerous indications that other agreements on campus are made which are neither reviewed nor reported to any central campus entity. * * * Included among these not well monitored and uncoordinated activities are various forms of facility use agreements. While some units offer outside visitors an array of opportunities to utilize campus facilities and/or participate in activities on campus, others offer no such opportunities, while others permit such activities without management and oversight, let alone a plan to cover incurred costs. Often events take place without widespread campus awareness or approval. These activities not only introduce potential risk management issues . . . but more pertinently may result in the University’s assumption of indirect costs for the maintenance and repair expenses that result.”
Who “owns” the venue?

A fundamental issue in considering coordination of facilities use are the practices regarding control of venues on campus. Policy within the CSU is that all facilities on campuses belong to the state (CSU system). (Exceptions exist in the case of the lease of land or facilities to auxiliaries such as the ASI or ASC.) While this fundamental policy is generally recognized, however, when translated into practice at CSUF, practices and, sometime written policies, have been developed that are “venuecentric” and which function apart from a concept of campus ownership overall. Basically, the perspective is that the primary user of the facility controls its utilization which cannot be utilized by others unless the user agrees. This perspective extends to independent, venue policies on rates and usage.

Establishment of a facility use coordination office with capacity to make assignment of space for rentals and events and oversee rental rates runs counter to the University practice and tradition. A general recognition that fundamentally all space is university space is required if a comprehensive facilities coordination office is to go forward. This is not to say that rental opportunities, for example, should take precedent over the use of facilities for the primary educational mission of the University.

Facilities Use and the Community.

While the primary purpose of the University is provision of educational programs, historically there has been recognition that the University has an obligation to contribute to the community beyond the offering of courses. The 1988 Manual states:

“Once the needs of the regular instructional program have been met, the university may address its secondary responsibilities, which include:

- Providing for the cultural, health, recreational, professional and instructionally related needs of the university community (students, faculty, and staff);

- Meeting the related needs of local communities and individuals, by providing access to campus educational and recreational resources;

- Exploring, and providing a forum for responsible debate on, ideas and matters of public import;

- Developing among students, employees, alumni, community leaders, and friends a strong base of continuing commitment, loyalty, and support which will assist the University in meeting its goals in a time of limited government funding.”

Notwithstanding the lack of a formal facilities use coordination office and staff, the University usually presents a welcoming face to the community. For example, a formal MOU with the City of Fullerton provides for community use of athletic facilities. The Arboretum located on the
campus is a well-recognized community resource. Countless plays, music performances and artistic events are open to community residents at modest or no cost. Many local residents attend the annual Concert Under the Stars (suspended in 2010 due to budgetary concerns). Free parking on weekends enhances the open door image of the campus to the community.

Even though event sponsors may make direct reimbursement for costs of MUR, wear and tear on buildings and playing fields as well as the staff effort required to oversee may lead many to conclude that the value received in terms of community outreach and rental income (if any) is simply not worth the effort. This perspective has the effect of a dampening of interest in working with outside groups (and with campus groups as well) in providing facilities and services for non-direct instructional activities.

**Athletics**

Currently, Athletics manages the rental of the major athletic facilities on campus including Goodwin Field, Titan Stadium, Titan Gymnasium, Anderson Family field and other playing fields. Renters include high schools, the City of Fullerton, selected events, sports teams, etc. There is a published rate sheet plus another indicating sponsorship opportunities. Athletics derives approximately $1.6 million per year in extramural income from rentals ($377,000), sponsorships, ticket sales, and marketing which goes toward the maintenance of facilities and fields and for the overall Athletics budget. Staff members are assigned to work with users and to facilitate necessary support and permitting for rentals and events. Over the last decade marketing and sponsorship agreement income has more than doubled and far exceeds income received by other campus units although there is some suggestion that the maximum amount achievable from sponsorships may be near. The athletics budget has a structural gap making extramural income including rental fees very important to the overall program.

**Housing**

Historically campus housing has not sought summer rental income to a significant degree. This has led campus summer out-reach programs to seek space off-campus at Hope International University, for example. This policy is in the process of change with the opening of the new 1000 plus-bed housing and dining facilities in fall 2011. Indeed the development of a summer rental clientele is built into the bond redemption business plan. A staff member will be assigned to the marketing function.

As Campus Housing seeks in-residence summer programs there will be need for facilities beyond the limited spaces available in the resident housing. This is, in effect, a new user for campus recreational facilities, meeting rooms, classrooms and other venues. One could imagine, for example a summer arts residence program making use of campus theaters, galleries and studios in collaboration with the College of the Arts. Other partnerships may be developed with the Titan Student Union (TSU) providing meeting space as could be the case with the Marriott Hotel located on campus. The point may be made that cooperation of all departments on the campus may be required if sufficient rental opportunities are to be
developed to assist in funding the housing facilities. Furthermore, rentals will need to be projected months and years ahead which requires data regarding facility availability in the future underlining the value of a master calendar.

**Master Calendar**

There is no campus-wide master calendar and reservation system in place. TSU employs a computer based system (EMS—Event Management System) which works well for a venue such as the TSU and the student funded Recreation Center. It is not clear if it could be adapted to handle multiple venues required for a campus-wide calendar and reservation system although the EMS prospectus suggests that it can. Campus Academic Scheduling relies on a manual system to assign individual classrooms. Laboratories and conference rooms are assigned by departments. (Discussions are currently underway within Academic Affairs regarding room assignments by college since it appears there is a wide variation in the classroom space available to the individual colleges and the academic departments.) The campus has purchased software (R25) which is reported to be a system that can function effectively university-wide. Its implementation by IT has been delayed due to workload issues. Whether there is in place a manual or electronic scheduling system, it is necessary for facility use data to be inputted into the system as a matter of routine.

One university lists the following issues that should be addressed in choosing a scheduling database:

1. Multiple users  
2. Academic schedule interface  
3. Online capabilities (website /master calendar, online requests, etc.)  
4. Double booking prevention  
5. Communication processes (email, workflow, etc.)  
6. IT friendly tech support  
7. Space inventory attributes  
8. Resource inventory attributes  
9. Customization options  
10. Security features  
11. Training & Education

**Facilities Maintenance**

A major issue confronting the University is the physical maintenance of fields, classrooms, buildings and open space. The importance of this issue increases year by year with continuing restrictive budgets and reduced state support for operations and capital improvements. Facility rentals provide some reimbursement for these expenses including staff time for monitoring and supervising events but by all accounts not enough.
There is, however, no campus-wide schedule of MUR charges for the use of campus facilities such as classrooms or meeting rooms. CSU system policy (EO 847) mandates cost recovery. (A rough reimbursement basis could be derived from estimated overall campus expenses of $10 per sq. ft. per year or data resulting from a sample of facility maintenance expenses.)

With intensive use, a major issue for the campus is assuring of sufficient down time to allow reseeding of playing fields, for example, to go forward.

**Facilities for the Arts**

The campus is fortunate in having available several significant arts-related venues with the Meng Concert Hall a stand-out architecturally and functionally. The College of the Arts has a Performance Venue written policy (October 2006) which emphasizes the instructional purposes of facilities and which in general discourages the rental of facilities to outside groups due to scheduling issues and protection of valuable equipment and facilities such as the concert hall. Possibilities for summer usage of arts facilities may be possible, however. In cases of campus sponsored arts performances, a lead time of 12 to 18 months may be required to fit the event in overall schedules. A comprehensive calendar of arts events for the academic year is published and distributed widely. Questions on availability of venues including lobby areas are referred to the Cultural Events Director of the College of the Arts.

**Filming**

Filming of motion pictures, television program episodes and commercials are perhaps the most visible uses of campus facilities by external groups. The location of the campus in southern California and the fact that the campus is within the 30 mile geographical radius from Hollywood which results in lower film costs according to union agreements provides opportunities for rentals not open to most colleges and universities. Furthermore, the Director of the Orange County Film Commission who is physically located on campus can provide assistance to location scouts giving the campus an edge in competing for video and filming opportunities.

Filming arrangements are typically facilitated by the office of Vice President for Academic Affairs although filming may entail use of athletics and Titan Student Union venues. Campus records indicate that in 2009-10 some $31,000 was received from filming-related services. The bulk of these funds were devoted to costs of maintenance, security, etc.

The document: Guidelines for Motion Picture/Video/Photography contains useful information for film permit seekers together with a basic fee schedule. The document, however, is not dated, is in draft form, and was not adopted. Apparently it was never placed in final form and distributed to those concerned. It does not address student filming permits.
Filming activities appear to be picking up for feature film locations and commercials. Time lines are often short for these projects and responding to facility rental requests are a challenge as they can cut across several campus units and areas of responsibility. Outsiders are not sensitized to the fact that various spaces on campus are the responsibility of differing units, e.g., the area in front of the TSA, campus quads, the swimming pool, the Arboretum, Housing, and that approvals may need to be sought from several different offices.

Film and video productions, though requiring extensive coordination, tend to be good sources of rental income as production companies have, in most cases, generous budgets.

Alumni

The Golleher Alumni House is available for rental to alumni and non-alumni groups including on-campus units which are expected to pay rental fees as well. There is a list of rental charges readily accessible through the campus web site. Rental receipts are retained by the CSUF Alumni association although the facility is maintained by the University.

Arboretum

The Fullerton Arboretum although on University property is operated independently. It maintains its own web site which includes rental schedules and event information.

Off-campus Facilities

At least four other facilities located off-campus may be rented under some circumstances. They include the CSUF Irvine campus, the Grand Central Art Center in Santa Ana, the Garden Grove Continuing Education Center, and Tucker Wildlife Sanctuary. These venues set their own policies and rental rates.

Parking and Directions

A significant issue in the rental of facilities that involve off-campus visitors is the availability of parking. During the academic year, Monday through Thursday nights parking is at a premium. Maximum use of the TSU conference rooms, for example, is restricted during this time period thus limiting TSU marketing efforts. For visitors who wish to park from Monday through Friday evenings it is normally necessary to purchase a permit from ticket dispensers or at one of the two Visitor Information Centers. A newcomer to campus would not know where the Visitor Information Centers or dispensers are located without prior direction. In some areas there are no permit dispensing options, e.g., parking lots surrounding College Park. Presently, one option is to advise a visitor who requires more than 30 minutes of parking to park at the Marriott Hotel lot. Further, there are no parking instructional signs on campus or directories to the various campus buildings.
Marketing Facility Rentals

If a prospective event planner or film shoot coordinator has no previously obtained name of a contact person a visit to the campus web site will be a frustrating affair since there are no links to rental information or filming policies. Information on some rentals can be found under athletics, the Arboretum and the TSU. There is no brochure or flyer indicating other campus facilities that may be rented for events or other activities. There is no single contact person for referrals or, for that matter, a roster of campus personnel responsible for individual venues. Visits to other CSU campus web sites can produce contact information and various rental policies, some time in great detail. That is not the case for CSUF.

IV. Benefits of Campus-wide Facilities Coordination

Why centralize? A presentation of the experience of an eastern university cites these reasons:

1. Increase campus communication.
2. Increase efficiency in scheduling space and resources.
3. Create a centralized calendaring process.
4. Decrease customer/employee frustration.
5. Streamline the event planning process to improve quality of events.
6. Develop a system tracking event-related tasks to determine changes for the upcoming year.
7. Increase access to non-traditional activity space.

Coordination of Venues. A summary developed as a part of a position justification statement in 2009 identified ten different administrative departments or units which have assumed or are assigned authority for the use of University facilities:

- Athletics
- Academic Affairs
- College of the Arts
- Mihaylo College of Business and Economics
- Dean of Students
- Housing
- Parking
- Alumni Affairs
- Auxiliary Services Corporation (College Park, the Bookstore Patio and Carl’s Jr).
- ASI (TSU, SRC, Becker Amphitheater and the Quad (Fullerton Arboretum can be added to this listing bringing the list to eleven)

Each of these entities has its own policies, procedures, rate structures, and scheduling office/coordinators.
Event Approvals. A prospective client from the community is confronted with the following functions or matters that need to be addressed in successfully presenting an event on campus:

- Determining appropriate venue(s) (Can involve more than one venue coordinator.)
- Determining availability (No campus wide events calendar.)
- Agreement on fees involved (Varying fee schedules.)
- Executing a lease/license for the facility use (Standard form executed by Contracts and Procurement or by ASC if catering is involved.)
- Certification of insurance/risk assessment (Determined by Contracts and Procurement)
- Possible legal issues (Referral to campus attorney by Risk Manager, Procurement)
- Policies regarding catering, alcoholic beverages (Titan Student Union)
- State Fire Marshal (Referral by Risk Manager, Contracts and Procurement)
- Security needs (Campus police)
- Special facility support needs such as an electrician/plumber, trash pick-up, etc. (Physical Plant)
- Parking requirements (Parking)

These functions and matters involve several different offices most located within the Administration and Finance reporting structure. Essentially no outside user—especially for the first time—can be expected to negotiate the steps without considerable assistance and guidance from campus offices and staff. There is no published check list or “Frequently Asked Questions” providing written guidance for prospective users.

Advantages of a Facilities Use Office/Officer. The complexity of the approval process suggests that coordination of effort would not only benefit the client, but could serve to reduce staff time through more clearly established approval routines and increased efficiencies through combined functions. Clearly, other universities have come to the same conclusion as they have established an office and designated point person to assist in the process not only to increase approval efficiencies, but to market rental opportunities as well.

The 2009 Position Justification regarding the benefits of establishing an office as developed by staff summarizes the benefits of a facilities use program:

1. Enable the university to better manage its facility resources
2. Improve coordination among daily events
3. Ensure the campus meeting all legal requirements concerning public use and access.
4. Increase the recovery of all costs
5. Enhance security
6. Minimize potential risk and unnecessary expenses due to unauthorized use
7. Improve the maintenance and upkeep of campus facilities
8. Protect the University’s brand and community relations
9. Permit the opportunity to market and promote use of University facilities and services to more potential users
10. Identify potential revenue stream for the University
11. Enable the creation of a true University calendar
12. Maintenance of a University facility use manual

Such an office would be responsible for maintaining a web site providing basic contact information and a summary of facilities available for rental. The office would, as well, oversee a facility use process, manage facility use policies and procedures, establish cost guidelines and oversee a University-wide facility use committee.

Issues Involved in Creating an Office for Facilities Coordination. Organizationally, where is the best administrative division location in which to place an office for facility coordination? On other campuses reporting lines for Facilities Coordination vary widely, reflecting varying campus histories. Options include:

- Administration and Finance
  - Risk management
  - Contracts and Procurement
- Physical Facilities Management
- Advancement
- Public Affairs
- Parking
- Student Union
- Housing
- Extended Education
- Auxiliary organization

In the case of CSUF, several of the services provided in the facilities coordination process report within the Division of Administration and Finance:

- Contracts and Procurement
- Risk management
- Police
- Parking
- Physical plant

Given the fact that the above reporting units are within the Division of Administration and Finance it is reasonable to conclude that the function of facility coordination should remain within that division with the Vice President for Administration and Finance responsible under primary delegation from the President of the campus.

Another possible choice could be Advancement/Public Affairs. This reporting location would give greater emphasis to marketing and community relations. This choice, however, would remove the administrative and legal focus on required approvals, such as contracts/licensing, risk assessment, etc. Another choice would be to expand the scope of the Academic Affairs’ venue coordinator capitalizing on the experiences of this division administrator who is at the
Associate Vice President level. An advantage of this approach would be the ready accessibility of academic facility scheduling, day-to-day working contacts with the college venues, and extension of existing relationships. The disadvantages include the fact that this is an administrative function for the whole campus, not solely for Academic Affairs.

Another possible location would be assigning the function to the TSU under an agreement with the campus. The advantage of this approach would be to benefit from the expertise of the TSU in marketing, scheduling and planning events operating under similar operational controls. However, while it may be useful to consider requesting the TSU to develop and maintain a campus-wide master calendar as they do for their own facilities, delegation of the total authority to assign, rent, and coordinate facility use to a non-state unit would be inadvisable since it results in a blurring of the locus of ultimate accountability. A similar concern would arise if the function were assigned to the Auxiliary Services Corporation.

In considering placement for the office, attention should be given to whether or not those who are responsible for the office operation have sufficient influence in the campus administration to troubleshoot and resolve conflicts when they arise. The responsible administrator, for example, should lead a campus-wide policy committee and be able to assure that venue coordinators provide necessary services in the rental process. From time to time it may be necessary to override concerns from one campus quarter or another in order to pursue events deemed most important to the University as a whole. Ready access to the responsible Vice President is most important in this respect and through that position to the President.

Finally, a Facilities Use Coordination office should address at least the following issues or gaps in service.

- No consistent fee policy leading to less revenues
- Lack of policies regarding use of revenues above cost recovery
- Inconsistent policies on use of venues depending upon “ownership”
- No campus wide web presence
- Inefficient practices for scheduling of events and venues
- No standing committee to oversee rental program
- Difficulty in locating points of responsibility
V. Recommendations

Optimum Program

Following are features of an optimum program intended to be the most efficient and effective from the perspective of facility user-renters and campus staffing and revenue streams:

1. Operation within a campus-wide understanding that all facilities and grounds belong to the University (state) and are ultimately subject to use and assignment by the University through the Office of Facilities Use Coordination or through other offices as expressly delegated. This would include Athletics. TSU, ASI and the Arboretum would be exempted from the policy.

2. A program office that is the interface between the client and campus approval offices and units providing services such as parking, facilities maintenance, etc.

3. A program office assuring that campus policies are easily understood and are updated regularly.

4. A process for developing a common and consistent schedule of charges for various spaces.

5. Collection of fees to be deposited into a University-wide fund together with a system to reimburse campus units such as Police and Physical Plant for expenses incurred.

6. Fees incorporating an administrative or overhead charge sufficient to underwrite the costs of the Facility Coordination office and, in the case of Athletics, sufficient extramural income to meet budgetary targets for non-state funding.

7. A robust marketing function designed to make full advantage of available facilities and spaces throughout the year.

8. Development and maintenance of a master facility use/events calendar with a rolling time line of at least two years.

9. Appointment of venue coordinators for the several spaces and facilities.

10. Assurance that campus web sites clearly provide instructions for reservation and rentals to prospective users of campus facilities.

11. Assurance that rental and rental waiver practices are consistent and equitable.

12. Provide for troubleshooting services in the case of disagreements between venues and users.
Phased Program

The tasks are too complex to anticipate the creation of an efficiently functioning facilities use coordination process over a short period. Establishment of the program should be planned for implementation incrementally to allow time for experimentation and campus staff (and public users) to become familiar with new practices.

The following are steps to be taken in the first phase of the program:

**Administrative assignment.** Assignment for overall responsibility of the Facilities Coordination program to the Vice President for Administration and Finance should be reaffirmed.

Three alternatives are suggested as the administrative location for the program within the Division of Administration and Finance.

- **Alternative One:** Placement of the program within the Facilities Management Unit directed by an Associate Vice President with significant campus visibility at all levels. This location is consistent with existing (if not implemented) assignment. Administration of a facilities use program is consistent with the overall mission of the unit.

- **Alternative Two:** Placement of the program within the office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance. This placement would assure that major issues could be readily brought to the attention of the Vice President when they arise.

- **Alternative Three:** Placement of the program in Contracts and Procurement. This placement would recognize the major role the unit plays in the rental approval process and the working relationships that exist with other areas of the campus. This assignment, however, might not sufficiently enhance the marketing function or address the matter of resolving issues among campus units that may arise.

**Staffing the Program.** The “phased program” should be staffed by two individuals (1.5 FTE). The **Coordinator** should be at least a half-time MPP individual with the following responsibilities:

1. Convening and chairing the Advisory Committee.
2. Overseeing the event approval/implementation process.
3. Marketing venue availability.
4. Representing the program to the campus community.
5. Recommending fee schedules for various venues.
6. Developing alternatives for campus master event schedules.

A **program associate** should be assigned on a full-time basis. The Associate would:
1. Serve as the day-to-day interface between clients, venue coordinators and approval offices.
2. Provide first line troubleshooting when issues arise.
3. Update venue coordinator listings, web site currency, monitor fee assessments.
4. Prepare public relations/advertising materials.

Facilities Use Coordinating Committee: Membership. A standing Facilities Use Coordinating Committee should be established. Such a committee has functioned formally or informally from time to time but no standing committee now is in place. Members should include representatives from the units/functions most concerned. These would include:

- Contracts and procurement
- Risk Management
- Police Department
- Advancement/Public Affairs
- Academic Affairs
- Student Affairs (Housing/ASI)
- Parking
- Physical Plant
- TSU

The committee would be chaired by the Facilities Use Coordinator when appointed. (Prior to that appointment, the Vice President for Administration and Finance should designate an interim chair.)

Facilities Use Coordinating Committee Charge. The committee should be charged initially with:

1. Identifying all University space that may potentially be used for events or other rentals.
2. Review and reaffirmation of use priorities, i.e., instruction highest priority, instructional support activities, fundraising, cultural events, and so on.
3. Recommending to the Vice President for Administration and Finance a schedule of fees for spaces including campus service fees.
5. Assure the appointment of venue coordinators who assist in working with clients.
6. Considering the need for a master calendar and how best to implement such a calendar including offices to maintain the calendar.
7. Providing advice and perspective to the coordinator when issues arise that need resolution.
8. Serving as the coordinating group in handling rentals.
9. Advising on the implementation of the program working toward full implementation of an “optimum program”.
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Funding the Program. The objective should be to achieve a self-support program in that fees collected above expenses would be sufficient to maintain the coordinating office. A service charge on each paid rental could accomplish this objective. At the same time fees should be sufficient to return funds to venues consistent with the devotion of staff time and campus resources beyond immediate cost. Careful attention must be given to the case of Athletics which must raise funds from facility rentals to meet a portion of their annual budget. Fees collected should be deposited into an all-university fund and dispersed according appropriate protocols. The topic of fee assessments should be one of the initial, major topics for the Advisory Committee.

In 2009-2010 some $405,000 were collected in facility rental fees plus another $31,000 in film-related income. It is not possible to determine how much of these funds were returned to venues beyond those required to meet immediate costs. If there were a 20% overhead charge for coordination expenses this would generate about $87,000, an amount though significant, most likely not enough to fund one and half staff persons plus operating expenses. A period of transition is needed of at least one year as new ground rules and policies are developed and publicized and concerted effort made to expand rental opportunities consistent with campus policies. Consequently, it is proposed that the staffing for the program in its initial year be funded from University sources, and then phased out in the subsequent year or years as service fee income warrants.
Individuals Contacted in the Course of this Review

Ryan Alcantara, Student Affairs
Judy Anderson, Ret. Exec. Vice President
Joe Arnold, College of the Arts
Janice Arrington, O.C. County Film Commission
John Beisner, Risk Management
Jay Bond, Facilities Management
Paulette Blumberg, Administration and Finance
Jeff Cooke, Advancement
Amir Dabirian, Information Technology
Tia Damron, Contracts and Procurement
Bill Dickerson, Auxiliary Services Corporation
Jeff Fehrn, Titan Student Union
Joe Ferrer, Parking
Shannon Glaab, Academic Affairs
Naomi Goodwin, Administration and Finance
Don Greene, Contracts and Procurement
Diana Guerin, Academic Senate
Bob Hutchinson, Cal Poly Pomona, Advancement (Events)
Judi King, Campus Police
Lisa Kopecki, Academic Affairs
Owen Holmes, Governmental Affairs
Fred Lipscomb, Housing
Irene Matz, College of Communications
Carol McDoniel, Titan Student Union
Frank Mumford, Auxiliary Services Corporation
Steve Murray, Academic Affairs
Robert Palmer, Student Affairs
Anil Puri, Mihaylo College of Business and Economics
Brian Quinn, Athletics
Chris Reese, Community Relations
Suzie Tsuji, Cal State Los Angeles, Administration and Finance
Mike Uraine, Athletics
Willem van der Pol, Physical Plant
Howard Wang, Student Affairs
Emit Williams, Cal State Dominguez Hills, Contracts and Procurement
Sally Yassine, Contracts and Procurement