

CAMPUS REENGINEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES
October 14, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Chair
Neil Markley
Sue Hayes
Erica Wilcher
Melinda Barnard
Lori Heffernon
Gloria Ogg
Katharyn Crabbe
Rich Marker
Richard Senghas
Perry Marker
Erik Dickson
Richard Ludmerer
Bruce Walker
Peter Neville
Nate Johnson
Jason Wenrick
Joel Grogan
Melanie Dreisbach
Ian Hannah
Laura Lupei

Eduardo Ochoa
Anna Reynolds-Smith
Carol Ingerman
Catherine Nelson
Elaine McDonald
Ruth Burke
Janice Peterson
Edna Nakamoto
Mike Kiraly
Tim Tiemens
Paul Lange
Steve Campbell
Bill Ingels
John Rauschkolb
Dan Condron
Katie Pierce
Tyson Hill
Nadir Vissanjy
Floyd Ross
Elizabeth Stanny

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Letitia Coate
Susan Kashack

Sam Scalise
Brian Jersky

AGENDA

- I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
- II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
- III. CRC CHARGE**
- IV. EVENT PARKING**
- V. BACKGROUND AND REFERENCE CHECKING**
- VI. INFORMATION SECURITY BLUE PAPER POLICIES**
- VII. UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLANNING**
- VIII. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFIARS**
- IX. FIVE YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM**
- X. ENROLLMENT GROWTH PROJECTIONS**
- XI. STUDENT HOUSING EXPANSION**
- XII. UNIVERSITY CENTER SCHEMATIC DESIGN**
- XIII. FACULTY/STAFF HOUSING**
- XIV. COMMON MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND THE CSU GRADUATION INITIATIVE**
- XV. ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**

I: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Larry Schlereth brought the meeting to order at 12:28 pm. Schlereth welcomed new members Joel Grogan, student representative and Paul Lange, locksmith and staff representative. CRC is now fully staffed.

Schlereth asked for a motion to approve the minutes of September 16, 2005. Katharyn Crabbe moved and Jason Wenrick seconded the motion. No objections were heard and the minutes were passed unanimously with abstentions from those not in attendance at the September 16, 2005 meeting.

II: VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Exterior Lighting

Schlereth formed a subcommittee at the September 16, 2005 meeting to examine the spotlight installed on the North side of Stevenson and make a recommendation to the committee. Rich Marker reported that the subcommittee met on September 21, 2005 and observed the spotlight at night. The subcommittee unanimously agreed that the light met the needs of the university and was less intrusive than other lights that have been installed. Marker has ordered additional lights. Nate Johnson noted that not all parking lots lights have been updated, and Bruce Walker replied that work on updating the lighting would continue this summer and the upgrade of lighting in campus parking lots is about halfway finished. Schlereth asked that Marker and Ryan Ernst prepare a press release for Susan Kashack once the new spotlights have been installed.

Hurricane Relief

Fundraising efforts at the SSE venues raised \$3,216.00 for hurricane relief. The Sallie Mae Fund matched the funds for a total of \$6,432.00 in donations to the American Red Cross.

III: CRC CHARGE

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Schlereth would like to review the CRC Charge due to discussion at the September 16, 2005 meeting. Originally, the CRC addressed issues involving the Residential Life and Student Health programs as well as other areas in Student Affairs. However, since CRC currently does not directly address Student Affairs programs, it may be time to rewrite the charge. Discussion ensued regarding important points that should be addressed including the advisory functions for fees and referendums, shared decision making, strategic planning, review and assessment and focus on the Administration and Finance Division and, where appropriate, SSE. Schlereth will review and compose a draft of the new charge for the next meeting.

IV: EVENT PARKING

Schlereth would like to establish a set fee for event parking. This would not be a mandatory fee and would not apply to GMC events, only large scale events such as the Eagles concert. The fee would need to cover parking costs for the event as well as generate some revenue for the parking program. Johnson explained the scope of an event like the Eagles which may require purchasing additional equipment and contracting with outside staffing such as CHP and RPDS. Johnson also recommends using an even dollar amount to make selling parking permits easier.

Schlereth introduced a motion for charging a \$10 event parking fee. Johnson moved and Sue Hayes seconded the motion. Peter Neville would rather consider the market value for the event on a case by case basis and recommends amending the motion to allow the fee up to \$15. Elaine McDonald seconded the motion. Schlereth clarified that in this case, the parking administration would make the final fee decision based on their discretion. No opposition was voiced to the amendment and the motion was amended.

The motion for event parking charges not to exceed \$15 was put to a vote. Objections were heard and Schlereth counted the votes, 27 for, 7 opposed and 7 abstentions. Motion passed and will be forwarded on to the Fee Advisory Committee for formal comment.

V: BACKGROUND AND REFERENCE CHECKING

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Schlereth asked for a motion to consider the Background and Reference Checking Guidelines. Edna Nakamoto moved and Crabbe seconded the motion. Schlereth emphasized that these

guidelines are generally not applicable to faculty and students unless their positions are deemed to be sensitive or in contact with minors. Hayes notes that the Faculty Standards Committee is creating a list of affected faculty and it is rather large. Discussion ensued regarding the "discretion" aspect of the guidelines and the determination of "sensitive position". Schlereth asked that Nakamoto meet with those who are concerned or have more input. The outstanding issues appear to be issues of judgment, determination of who has "minor" status, how to deal with special consultants and volunteer employees and whether or not registered sex offenders should be addressed in these guidelines. Johnson recommended that a disclosure statement be added that the policy does not supersede other reporting requirements as prescribed by law. Schlereth would also like to bring in a representative from Faculty Affairs to provide input. Nakamoto noted that the guidelines need to be in effect in time for summer hiring. Schlereth asked that more feedback be collected in a working session and bring the results to a future meeting.

VI: INFORMATION SECURITY BLUE PAPER POLICIES

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Personal Confidential Information

Floyd Ross moved to consider the Personal Confidential Information policy, the motion was seconded by Hayes. Discussion ensued regarding the possible scope of PCI on campus computers and possible methods for assisting users in ridding their computer of PCI. Schlereth would like to hire someone on a short term basis who would facilitate the process. Johnson recommends adding complete date of birth to the list of information that qualifies as PCI. Schlereth will wait for feedback from other committees before asking for approval of the policy.

Computer and Network Usage

Ross moved to consider the Computer and Network Usage policy, the motion was seconded by Wenrick. Elizabeth Stanny called attention to Section IIIA 2b and moved to change "must" to "should". Motion was seconded. Discussion ensued regarding the consequences for non-compliance to the policy and lack of resources to comply. Richard Senghas recommended changing "division" to "department" to assist in addressing financial issues. Neil Markley recommended using the word "must" in order to keep the policy firm. Schlereth noted that the policy may be premature and there may need to be a university wide task force made up of members of the AVAC and CRC to determine costs for securing information.

Wenrick stated that the wording should remain "must" because, from an IT standpoint, it is important to keep the policy cut and dried as the ultimate goal is to secure the network. Eduardo Ochoa believes the policy should be more of a guide to implementation but there is an assumption that the resources are available. Senghas stated his belief that the policy is on target and that the University will eventually need to enforce this policy for security reasons. Senghas also noted that the existence of a strict policy might allow us to leverage more resources from the CSU or the state. Stanny emphasized that the issue should be framed in the context of strategic initiatives. Erik Dickson noted that the issue of response to and subsequent cost of an incident is not fully addressed in the policy. Schlereth asked that those who are interested in this issue contact Ian to create a group with Sam Scalise and other IT representatives to consider the areas that may be impacted and the potential costs. The issue may then be tied into the IT strategic plan. Stanny withdrew her motion. Bruce Walker noted that there should be some urgency in working on this project as the university has a lot of confidential information that needs to be protected. Ogg commends Scalise for drafting the policy and getting the issue on the table.

VII: UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLANNING

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Campus Strategic Planning Document

Schlereth asked the committee members to review the University Strategic Plan.

Division Strategic Plan

Administration and Finance is proceeding with establishing strategic initiatives without a completed university strategic plan. Discussion ensued regarding prioritization of the strategic initiatives. Ochoa noted that planning cannot always be linear but he would like to see a clearer connection illustrated between the division objectives and the strategic plan of the division and the university. Laura Lupei commented that this was one of the goals of the assessment project. Nakamoto would like to change the Management Training Program initiative to Staff/Management Training Program. Schlereth would like to present the strategic plan and division objectives to both faculty and student governance.

Division Objectives: 2005-2006

The 2005-2006 Administration and Finance Objectives tie in with the Division's strategic plan.

VIII: CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Year-End Financial Report

Schlereth brought to the attention of the committee the one-time funding of \$355,000 from the chancellor's office to support staff and technology. This funding was cut in the previous year and the division will need to find alternate ways of funding for this in the future.

Darwin Hall Interim Funding

The division has an outstanding balance of \$220,110 still owed for Darwin Hall interim funding and is in the process of identifying funding sources. The funding will most likely come from pooled salary savings.

New Restricted Funds

The low enrollment has created huge revenue implications that will impact Spring 2006. The CSU will not retract funds but will adjust accordingly for the next academic year.

New Discretionary Funds

Due to the resource issue with the Information Security policies, there may not be a position for information security officers which would free up \$185,000 reflected under the New Discretionary Dollars.

Enrollment Implications: SEE and Housing Revenue

Due to low enrollment, housing has closed down approximately 200 beds. This causes a loss of revenue that is risky in relation to the amount of debt that is held by housing. Housing has high reserves, but that is necessary to cover the large amount of debt. The shortfall for Dining services is approximately \$350,000. This funding was planned to cover such expenses as the Environmental Impact Report for the Faculty/Staff Housing Project, the next phase of the One Card project, and equipment purchase for the Green Music Center.

Endowment Distribution

Endowment Distribution totaled over \$884,000 for 2005-2006 which is three times as much as last year. This is due to a better investment policy and a better market. Schlereth will provide more detailed information on exactly where the money went. This data also does not reflect direct gifts to departments; those will be added in as well. The \$59,000 to Administration and Finance is the Schulz endowment for Information Technology.

IDC Distribution

Schlereth credits Ochoa and Tony Appoloni for a remarkable job turning around the IDC problem. Ochoa discussed the process of reviving this program. Schlereth noted that we will need to look towards these alternate funds to a greater degree in the future. Schlereth would like to have the IDC Distribution presentation shown to the CRC at next month's meeting.

Projected Extended Education Distribution

There has not been much change with this figure from the previous year.

Green Music Center Finances

This item deferred for future discussion.

IX: FIVE YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Schlereth brought the member's attention to the Classroom Faculty Office Building, which is blocked out in various potential locations on the campus master plan. Walker has worked with the Chancellor's Office to promote the University's need for a new building by 2007 based on the growth projections of 500 FTES. Further study is needed and strong justification is required to get the building high on the CSU's list of priorities. The next issue is to determine what should be housed in the building. To assist in making this determination the projection numbers for 2010-2011 broken down by discipline and grade level are being considered. Rose Bruce is conducting a more detailed examination of these numbers, taking into account trends in disciplines and the graduate/undergraduate breakdown. Schlereth would also like to emphasize both the political and donor influences on this project. The location for the potential building is currently undetermined.

X: ENROLLMENT GROWTH PROJECTIONS

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Schlereth asked the committee members to review this information which was provided by the Chancellor's Office.

XI: STUDENT HOUSING EXPANSION

(Please see the October 14, 2005 Agenda Packet for this document)

Freshman Class Size Projections

It is important to determine if our freshman class will reach projection by 2008 because it directly affects the demand for the next phase of student housing. This information needs to be analyzed as it feeds directly into strategic planning.

XII: UNIVERSITY CENTER SCHEMATIC DESIGN

The University Center has been a longstanding priority of the student body, the Bookstore and Dining Services. The projected cost is about \$32 million and it would be located south of the Recreation Center. The project ties into the projected freshman class growth as they will outgrow the Zinfandel Dining Hall. The University Center Task Force would like to proceed with the schematic design phase which would require funds from Entrepreneurial Activities, Associated Students and the Student Union.

XIII: FACULTY/STAFF HOUSING

Sue Hayes discussed a presentation of the Faculty/Staff Housing project at Academic Senate which was also attended by the mayor of Rohnert Park and a concerned citizen.

Funding the Environmental Impact Report

This need has been put on hold until the sewage issue can be addressed.

Funding Legal Consultation

Schlereth explained that the city of Rohnert Park does not feel that they are required to provide sewage service to the Faculty/Staff Housing site because it lies outside of the urban growth boundary. The University disagrees and will need expert council to advise on this issue. Resources for funding this need must be addressed.

XIV: COMMON MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND THE CSU GRADUATION INITIATIVE

Deferred

XV: ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER

None

Meeting was adjourned at 3:48 pm.

Minutes prepared by Laura Lupei