

**CAMPUS FOOD SERVICES AD-HOC COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**MARCH 6, 2018**

**RFP No. 18C0001  
FOOD AND/OR CONCESSION SERVICES  
FOR VARIOUS CAMPUS LOCATIONS**

<b>PRESENT:</b> Mark B. Logan – Purchasing	Andrea Wittig – President’s Office
Richard Crother – Theater	Christopher Richardson – HPEA
Angela Teshima – IERP	Stephanie A. F. Barlow – Purchasing
Elizabeth Miller – Student Services	Rachel Mason – Bus. Ed./Hum./SS
Ramona Mellgoza – Purchasing	Phil Herrera – ASCC
Mayra Radillo – Purchasing	Christopher Rodriguez - ASCC

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Logan called the meeting to order at 11:06 am, in the Auto Partners Building, Room 11.

**II. INTRODUCTIONS**

Mr. Logan introduced himself and indicated that he would be serving in a non-voting, facilitator capacity (unless there happened to be a tie vote). He briefly described reaching out to all constituent groups on campus so that representation on the committee was equitable. All present at the meeting introduced themselves around the table. Mr. Logan clarified that Ms. Teshima is present to assist the committee with the survey, and would be non-voting. He also indicated that Ms. Radillo, Ms. Mellgoza, Ms. Barlow are present in a facilitation capacity and would be non-voting as well. Mr. Logan provided information regarding the discussion and feedback received from the prior Food Services RFP. There was a brief discussion of the information binder that was handed out to all attendees.

**III. GENERAL INFORMATION**

Mr. Logan provided a brief background of how the need to increase communication on campus, but still follow the RFP process, initiated the forming of the Committee. The Committee serves to facilitate communication to and from the constituent groups and allows for discussion of items from the meetings. In contrast, the RFP evaluation committee cannot share information, similar to a hiring committee, as the material discussed is all confidential. Members of the Committee are encouraged to share information with their constituent groups, and to also share any feedback received. Committee members were reminded to be sure to speak for their respective group in the meetings, and not just for themselves. The Committee will need to determine ways to encourage campus attendance at future meetings.

**IV. PURPOSE OF AD-HOC COMMITTEE**

Mr. Logan informed the members that the Committee obligation would be a three month duration, with the purpose being to develop the statement of work for the next RFP and develop a survey. Once the solicitation is released, ideally in August, the committee will be concluded.

One of the items the Committee will discuss is beverage pouring rights and vending services. Currently, the college is a Pepsi campus with a contract is on auto-renewal every 6 months. The college's vending services are on auto-renewal on a month-by-month basis. The college could receive more benefits from companies by having a termed contract. The Committee would need to discuss being a Pepsi or Coke campus, and both companies can provide dry good vending. Pepsi does have an exclusivity clause, and the campus/food service vendors cannot sell competing Pepsi-related beverages.

## **V. FOOD SERVICES SURVEY**

There was discussion regarding input on the new 2018 survey. In addition to the food services, we will need information regarding beverages and vending, possibly to include campus preference for Coke or Pepsi. The survey would be released during the spring semester so that information collected can be included in the RFP. Ms. Teshima requested clarification regarding if the survey was intended to be released by the semester end, or to have the survey released and analyzed before the semester end since there would be a tight schedule involved. Mr. Logan responded that the intent was to develop the survey in March, release it in April, and have analyzed results in June. He added that the RFP would be going before the Board as an Informational Item prior to release.

There was discussion regarding increasing participation on campus, specifically addressing comments received that most of the submittals were students, and other voices were not heard. Ms. Miller mentioned that with the last survey, her department had iPads out on campus to capture responses in person which was successful. There was brief discussion as to the best locations to have iPads, and combining efforts with the student election to boost responses. Ms. Teshima mentioned that if emails announcing a survey come directly from SurveyMonkey, some students may have opted to block these. It would be better if emails regarding the survey came from staff with a link to the survey.

Ms. Wittig reminded the Committee that all groups need to feel like they have a voice, not just the students. Ms. Mason suggested that it might be a good idea to tell faculty early about the survey, possibly at a Division level. She also indicated that in looking closer at the numbers for the survey results, they were somewhat representative of the various constituent groups. Mr. Logan inquired about the possibility of having a raffle for the other constituent groups (not just the students) to increase participation. There was discussion regarding what questions should be included in the survey such as: questions indicating people's emotions and feelings, more vendor specific questions, ensuring questions are concise, etc. A recurring theme was that the relationship between the vendors and the college was not adequately addressed and this was problematic.

Mr. Herrera inquired if this committee would be approaching vendors. He cited an example of not eating at Frantone's due personal reasons, but also sees the 25+ year relationship and didn't feel they were handled well. He stated that while the relationships are important, the vendors maintaining standards and not becoming complacent were also important. Ms. Miller responded that quarterly vendor meetings are now occurring and will be open to public. Feedback can also be provided to the Student Life Committee. Ms. Mason responded that vendors who are don't respond

to feedback, would provide good reason to terminate the contract with them. Mr. Rodriguez stated that the vendors need to be evaluated on merit. If the food on campus is low quality, students will go elsewhere. Mr. Logan added that ensuring students stay on campus and spend more time here, will only serve to increase student success. Mr. Richardson inquired about determining how people view each vendor as a relationship vendor versus a revenue vendor.

Mr. Logan stated that the real desire on campus needs to be determined so that specific requirements on the statement of work can be requested. Initially, the Board had asked for healthy options, quality, affordability, and local participation. It is unique to this college to have multiple vendors on campus. Many food vendors have an “all or nothing game” to help alleviate loss of profit, and some may not be willing to do business with us.

**VI. FUTURE MEETINGS**

It was determined that the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays from 11:00 AM to 12:30 PM were best. If a Committee member cannot attend, they are to designate an alternate and provide updated information to them prior to the meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for March 20, 2018 at 11:00 AM, with the location to be determined.

**VII. MEDIA**

Mr. Logan inquired as to how the Committee wanted to communicate/outreach and mentioned the Daily Falcon and Campus Connection. Mr. Rodriguez suggested discussion at Student Leadership groups. Ms. Mason suggested discussion at Division level meetings.

**VIII. AD-HOC COMMITTEE WEBSITE OVERVIEW**

Mr. Logan reviewed the website with the Committee and indicated how to link to the page from the Purchasing website. The agendas, minutes, and any pertinent additional information would be housed here. The webpage also has a “Contact Us” page so that anyone can submit feedback to the Committee at any time. The feedback will come to the Purchasing Department via email, which will be brought to the Committee for review. Mr. Crother suggested that we should post information about the website near the vendor sites on campus. Mr. Rodriguez suggested placing a QR code on the posted information so that people can scan it with their phones.

**IX. NEXT STEPS**

Ms. Wittig inquired if the next meeting would discuss the survey and stated that ideas should be submitted in advance to agendize. Ms. Teshima agreed since the survey questions would need to be organized for review to have a survey ready after the March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, and suggested that the questions are sent to Ms. Barlow to consolidate. Once Ms. Teshima has the survey, she could send that to Ms. Barlow for disbursal to the Committee. Ms. Mason suggested that perhaps our Committee could look into a shared document where all members can make edits. Ms. Barlow indicated that she would look into this. Mr. Logan advised that past information received for the RFP may no longer be as heavily weighted and that honest feedback from constituent groups would be key moving forward.

**X. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**

There were no items from the floor.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:22 pm.