

**CAMPUS REENGINEERING COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 22, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Chair	Eduardo Ochoa
Melinda Barnard	Ruth Burke
Steven Campbell	Letitia Coate
Dan Condron	Jenifer Crist
Erik Dickson	Christopher Dinno
Peter Flores	Dolly Freidel
Ian Hannah	Sue Hayes
Tyson Hill	Bill Ingels
Carol Ingerman	Nate Johnson
Kelley Kaslar	Mike Kiraly
Paul Lange	Rick Ludmerer
Laura Lupei	Perry Marker
Rich Marker	Neil Markley
Elaine McDonald	Robert McNamara
Charles Mikulik	Peter Neville
Gloria Ogg	Tom Ormond
Katie Pierce	Janice Peterson
Chuck Rhodes	Anna Reynolds
Floyd Ross	Vincent Richman for Elizabeth Stanny
Sam Scalise	Andrew Sloan
Tim Tiemens	Tim Wandling
Jason Wenrick	Erica Wilcher
Xiaodong Zhu	

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Katharyn Crabbe	Lori Heffernon
Susan Kashack	Nadir Vissanjy

GUESTS PRESENT:

David Abbott	Dee Dee Brannan
--------------	-----------------

**AGENDA**

- I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
- II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
- III. CAMPUS CONSULTATION**

- IV. CAMPUS STORE REVIEW GROUP**
- V. STRATEGIC PLANNING**
- VI. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**
- VII. GREEN MUSIC CENTER**
- VIII. BEAUJOLAIS VILLAGE II: TUSCANY**
- IX. UNIVERSITY CENTER**
- X. ONE CARD**
- XI. FACULTY STAFF HOUSING**
- XII. ENTREPRENEURIAL PRESENTING SEASON**
- XIII. ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**

## **I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

May 12, 2006

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth called the meeting to order at 12:15 pm. Schlereth welcomed the committee to the first meeting of the fall semester. Schlereth asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2006 meeting. Floyd Ross moved; Jason Wenrick seconded. No objections or changes were heard and the minutes were approved unanimously with abstentions from those who were not in attendance at the May meeting.

## **II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

(Please see the September 22, 2006 Agenda Packet for related documents)

Schlereth welcomed the new members of the committee. Tim Wandling from the English Department joins us as Chair-elect of the Academic Senate. Vincent Richardson from Business and Economics will act as proxy for Elizabeth Stanny. Our new student representatives are Andrew Sloan and Charles Mikulik. Tom Ormond replaces Brian Jersky as the faculty representative from the School of Science and Technology. We also have four new management trainees. Jenifer Crist joins us from the Bookstore and will be working in Entrepreneurial Activities under Neil Markley assisting Ryan Ernst with the marketing and One Card programs. Xiaodong Zhu formerly worked in CIHS and will now be working in the Employee Relations area with Joyce Suzuki. Peter Flores was with Conferences, Events and Catering and will be working with Jason Wenrick on CMS. Kelley Kaslar was also with CEC and will be working in the Risk Management area with Rick Ludmerer. Crist, Zhu and Flores will be pursuing their degree in the MBA program; Kaslar will be getting her MPA. The management training program now has nine trainees. Schlereth thanked those from CRC who participated on the hiring committee. The management training programs is one of the best programs to come out of the CRC and all trainees have made enormous contributions to the Division and the University.

There are currently two searches underway for senior managers. There is a national search to fill the position of Senior Director for CPDC, with Schlereth chairing the search committee. There is also a search for the Senior Director of CMS with Letitia Coate as

the chair of the search committee. Schlereth would like to have both appointments complete by January 1, 2007.

Schlereth addressed the changes in the Human Services department. An email was sent in June to the campus community as notification that Edna Nakamoto is no longer in the Senior Director position in Human Services. In the interim we are undertaking a comprehensive review of the entire Human Services organization to ascertain if there are opportunities to save money and improve service while still operating within the human services charge. This summer, an RFP process to engage a management consultant was undertaken and we contracted with the Pappas Consulting Group. Schlereth, Coate, Ian Hannah and Laura Lupei are working with the consultants as the Project Steering Committee. A recommendation will come from the consultants for reorganization and will be brought to CRC. Schlereth and Coate are currently providing the leadership for that unit, but are not making any changes until the recommendation comes from the consultants. Additionally, the Division is working with Carol Blackshire-Belay who has been very helpful regarding the Faculty Affairs office. Eduardo Ochoa added that staff turnover in the Faculty Affairs office gives Academic Affairs an opportunity to reexamine their operation in Faculty Affairs at the same time.

This summer the renovation of Darwin Hall was completed within budget and on time. Schlereth acknowledged the work of Christopher Dinno and Nora Hild from CPDC. The successful completion of this project is also due to the entire campus community who worked together to make the transition appear to be seamless even though there was a massive amount of work behind the scenes.

This summer also featured the wonderful Green Music Chamber Series and Green Music Festival coordinated by Floyd Ross and Jeff Langley. The events went very well and Schlereth thanked all involved for their hard work.

The Financial Services department was recognized for Excellence in Financial Reporting from the State Controller's Office for the seventh consecutive year. This is a noteworthy achievement. The books were closed on time for the campus and four auxiliaries. Schlereth recognized the efforts of Coate and the entire Financial Services management team as well as all fiscal managers at the University.

Over the two days of Move-In Weekend, the Housing staff facilitated the move in of 2,400 students into the residential community which is completely full this year. This is a significant effort involving nearly every aspect of the administration and always receives outstanding comments from students and parents. Schlereth recognized Tim Tiemens and the Housing Office as well as the efforts of Residential Life, Facilities, IT, Dining Services and Police Services for their role in making move-in such a seamless event.

In addition to the successes over the summer, A&F had many other remarkable achievements in 05/06. Included in the agenda packet is a listing of 25 of those achievements, though many more are not listed here. Schlereth expressed thanks and

appreciation to each of the committee members for their role in assisting the Division towards these accomplishments.

### **III. CAMPUS CONSULTATION**

Schlereth would like to open up to the committee the topic of campus consultation and would like to have this topic on the agenda for the next few meetings. It appears that we could do a better job at consultation than we have been doing on this campus. CRC itself is a consultative body so it may be helpful to have an open dialogue about this topic in this forum to determine if the consultative process is broken and, if so, determine how we can develop steps to fix it. Especially to consider what steps can be taken on the administrative side to make the campus feel that the consultative activities that we undertake have validity and integrity. The contracting out of the Bookstore is the issue that has brought the campus consultation into question. As we go forward with our strategic planning, there will be further items of controversy and it is important to ensure that there are some sort of consultative guidelines established to prevent future issues.

Elaine McDonald thanked Schlereth for putting this item at the top of the agenda. It is clear that the campus does need to work on consultation and she welcomes any suggestions. She would like to add to the list of discussion points to solicit suggestions on how to get the information out to the representative bodies and then have those bodies provide feedback on suggestions to bring back to this committee.

Schlereth asked Erik Dickson and Peter Neville to provide an explanation of the consultative process on the student side for the Associated Students Senate and the Student Union Board of Directors.

Dickson explained that the AS Senate meets once a week. At that time any student who acts as a representative to other committees supplies a report to the Senate of all happenings and fields questions. Senators then meet with advisory councils, other members of the student body, etc. as needed to get the word out and get the conversation started. The Senate is mainly used as a vehicle for conversation. The official voice of the Senate is used when the senators issue a resolution.

Neville explained that there is usually not much conversation about the CRC at the Board of Directors meetings except as it directly relates to the Student Union, such as the University Center. Neville does send out the CRC minutes to his staff.

Schlereth mentioned that a few years ago, he used to provide reports to the Academic Senate regarding CRC. Melinda Barnard added that this responsibility was switched to the Academic Senate Chair or Chair-elect. Tim Wandling noted that there does appear to be a communication problem between CRC and the Senate because there is a lack of reporting.

Schlereth wondered if it might be helpful if he asked for more consultation instead of presenting solutions to the committee. This strategy of presenting solutions may be interpreted as though the problem has already been solved and the course decided.

Barnard said that it appears to be more of an issue of the Academic Senate representatives getting the information out to the Senate. She sits on this committee as a representative of the School of Arts and Humanities but there is no explicit direction of who she should report information back to.

McDonald suggested that if the CRC followed a rule of first and second readings it might make it clearer when an issue is an information item rather than being a discussion item.

Ochoa pointed out that the University is a complex organization, with a division of labor and expert areas. The entire campus community can't have a say in each decision that is made. All the appropriate steps were taken in making the Bookstore decision, but perhaps if there is a concern that an issue is going to be controversial, we should create a way of getting extra consultation. Part of the problem may be that there is no shared understanding across the campus areas of what consultation really means. The campus seems to have a culture of not distinguishing the consultative process from the outcomes of that process. The consultative process should provide legitimacy to decisions regardless of whether everyone agrees with the outcome or not.

Tim Wandling agreed with Ochoa and added that it is important to ask for feedback to be considered instead of presenting something as an informational item.

Dolly Freidel suggested that a general outline of an issue be provided to faculty representatives for them to pass on so that different versions of the issue aren't being circulated.

Neil Markley expressed concern regarding the perpetuation of confusion and misunderstanding of the facts and issues regarding the Bookstore issue. The response was reactionary rather than fully informed and then the Academic Senate hears that illegal things have happened even though that wasn't the case. So to take something to another representative body without knowing all the facts first is a concern.

Schlereth asked if he should even continue to have the CRC. The campus has set up structures that have certain areas of responsibility. CRC was originally created to take care of things that no one was doing. But, if the AS wants to make a decision regarding their area of purview, they make it internally. But we create these committees to make decisions and then the decisions aren't honored. This is going to continue to happen, for example, the Faculty/Staff Housing Rules Subcommittee is going to issue a set of rules. Not everyone will agree, but the group will have spent a lot of time working on those rules. Perhaps we should create a campus wide committee to examine our culture of consultation.

Ochoa said that the main issue is the matter of trust. The consultative bodies of this campus are already quite transparent. At some point the members of the community have to reward that transparency with some sort of trust.

McDonald replied that there are reasons why the trust isn't there and we can't just flip a switch and have a trusting culture. She suggests putting more in writing and considering the works of committees to be drafts until broader campus feedback is requested.

Neville agrees with Ochoa that the issue is not so much about consultation as it is about the campus culture and a lack of trust. It may be helpful to help the campus community better understand who is in charge of things on the non-academic side as well as communicating the sophistication and complexity of some of these projects to assist with the creation of trust and respect.

Wandling said that rules and guidelines for communication should be created. He underscored the point that communication needs to happen as early as possible in the decision making process.

Schlereth responded that he would never express his opinion on a matter that was curricular. It is not his area of expertise. So, it seems overstepping for the Academic Senate to comment on administrative issues. The faculty should and does have a role in decision making of administrative matters, but the proper place for that may not be the Academic Senate.

Andrew Sloan thought that there may be ways to promote the minutes since they are already published online. It may be helpful to make more of an effort to have campus members refer to the minutes and to highlighted points of dialogue and questions that are raised.

Chuck Rhodes made the point that the students in the residential community knew about the Bookstore changes. They had been talking about it for a long time and weren't objecting to it. The students are a major part of the constituency that are effected and the ones who use, benefit and staff the bookstore. The consultation and communication on the student side seems to have been done correctly.

Barnard said that the transparency of the process is one thing, flow of information is another but both issues are separate from the mail issue of consultation. Does consultation really mean that for any issue, we are supposed to send it out to the whole University for feedback, get responses from everyone and then take that all into consideration? Instead, faculty members are here on this committee to provide that consultation. To expect that every issue is to be sent out in an issue paper to the whole campus is not realistic.

Schlereth said that, at the end of the day, he is the one who is going to be held responsible for these decisions and sometimes he has to make a decision that isn't popular but is necessary.

Ochoa believes that it is necessary to have a better articulation of what it means to consult; that the consultation process is advisory and not absolute.

Dickson addressed the lack of trust between administration and faculty. This has been a concern of the Associated Student President for years; it has actually been a topic of the convocation of each president for the past five years. The students' position is that this problem needs to be fixed and that it is an issue that should take front and center. The students are concerned that they have a voice on campus but it is being drowned out by all of the noise from the faculty and administration's disagreements.

Schlereth would like to continue this discussion at the October meeting. He will prepare some principles to start to set the ground rules of what consultation means in the CRC.

#### **IV. CAMPUS STORE REVIEW GROUP**

(Please see the September 22, 2006 Agenda Packet for related documents)

From the recent meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee came a resolution that A&F and the Academic Senate should work together through a subcommittee to analyze the Bookstore. A charge for the subcommittee needs to be finalized and four faculty, four staff, four students and four administrators need to be identified. This group will evaluate the decision that has been made and assess the financial, ecological and social performance of Barnes and Noble versus the independent Bookstore.

McDonald spoke to the discussion in the Executive Committee and they accepted the draft charge. She has only one clarification, that it be designated as a joint effort between the Academic Senate and CRC. Schlereth agreed and will change the document. McDonald also expressed appreciation of Schlereth's willingness to bring the charge to the committee as a draft.

Sue Hayes questioned the intention of this subcommittee. How are the cultural mission and educational mission impacts going to be evaluated? Schlereth responded that the committee is going to have to make those determinations. Hayes does not think this charge is an effective piece of writing and it will take more effort to interpret the intentions than to do an actual evaluation. The whole thing should be revisited.

Ochoa would like to see a requirement added to the charge requiring the committee to provide a cost/benefit analysis of its own activities at the conclusion of the committee's work. Though it is important to evaluate decisions it is also important to be the kind of organization that allocates its resources in a valuable way. At what point are we not getting that much more out of it?

Hannah added that the bookstore contract is still relatively new, so even if a way to evaluate its impacts is determined, it may still be a premature evaluation.

Mikulik thinks that the charge has good questions that should be asked. However, the cultural mission of the University is in question and this could be more specifically defined.

Dickson noted that the AS Senate is discussing a resolution to not consider any debate of Barnes and Noble vs. the former independent bookstore. The students are not interested in looking back and would not be in favor of this subcommittee review.

Wandling sees this as a forward looking process rather than looking backwards. It will help to address campus concerns. To make this point, the language in the charge should be changed from “has had” to “will have”.

Robert McNamara opposes the resolution and is concerned about setting up this subcommittee. He questions whether it is worth the resources, or if it is too early and there isn't anything to measure.

Markley commented that he is interested in undertaking this review. However, it does reiterate our consultative issues. For example, what if the students don't want to be involved in this process but we carry on anyway? And how are we going to avoid a firestorm after the results are released?

McDonald believes that this process may do a lot towards alleviating the trust issue. She appreciates the time that Markley and Schlereth have spent meeting with the Academic Senate and Executive Committee. She also thinks that this approach of the analysis of the “triple bottom line” is important. There are other ways a business decision can impact a community other than just the economic impacts.

Hayes asked what data is going to be used as comparison data against Barnes and Noble. Projecting past performance of the independent store while changing the variables?

Schlereth emphasized that this will not be a quick process. It will take at least a year before the subcommittee has any findings. They may examine if Barnes and Noble met financial expectations. What then happened to this wealth? What is the use of this wealth? What is the impact on employees? Any standards that are established should come back to CRC for consensus that it is a good measure.

Ochoa agrees that there should be a baseline data set and time period in order to be able to have something to assess and the group should establish these first.

Schlereth added that the issue may have more to do with the issue of outsourcing rather than the bookstore itself. Outsourcing of items that are not core competencies is a trend across universities. As we look at more and more reengineering activities, it is important to determine our campus culture regarding outsourcing. Our campus has a longstanding tradition of doing things internally but it may be more effective to outsource.

Mikulik noted that, from a student perspective, it is not necessarily a question of outsourcing, per se, but rather, a question of who we are outsourcing to. The reasons that we choose the companies we do and the range of our choices for outsourcing needs to be communicated.

Gloria Ogg added that she doesn't think this subcommittee is going to satisfy those who are dissatisfied with the bookstore contract. The most vocal opponents want to examine Barnes and Noble against Copperfield's and North Light and this group is not going to make that comparison. She doesn't think this is worth the time and effort. For the future, there should be an evaluation at the end of the five years, but to do that now, doesn't make much sense. Whatever the findings are, not everyone is going to buy into it anyway.

Schlereth asked anyone on the committee to let him know if they are interested in serving on this sub-committee. The acceptance of this charge will be an action item in October.

Dickson added that this charge will be presented at the AS Senate.

## **V. STRATEGIC PLANNING**

(Please see the September 22, 2006 Agenda Packet for related documents)

These topics will continue to be discussed over the course of the year. Decisions will be made at various times over the year.

The University Strategic Planning Committee has established nine goal areas and now each goal area has been assigned a convener to gather members of a subcommittee to begin to establish initiatives for that goal area. There are three goal areas that are of direct relevance to this committee. First, Preparing the Infrastructure for Enrollment Growth for which Schlereth is the convener. There are a number of specific objectives under that goal area that are being actively worked on in this division. The second goal area is the Quality of Student Experience for which Markley is the convener. The third goal area is Faculty and Staff Development for which Letitia Coate is the convener. Schlereth reminded the committee that he is taking the strategic planning process very seriously. If an activity is not in the plan, generally we do not do it. Schlereth provided a status update on some of the objectives. The campus is looking to have a draft strategic plan by the end of this semester. There should be similar lists of objectives for the other goal areas.

Barnard asked who is reviewing the objectives to ensure that they are the appropriate ones?

Ochoa responded that some things that go beyond business needs to university-wide needs and this is not yet reflected in these lists. These lists are not the sum total of the university priorities under these goal areas.

Schlereth added that not all division activities need to necessarily be approved through the University Strategic Planning Committee. For example, the One Card program is not funded by the general fund, so if SSE or Associated Students want to do something with their own money within these University wide goal areas, the USPC may disagree, but the areas need to follow their own objectives as well.

McDonald added that the USPC plans on prioritizing and ranking the goals and objectives in the Spring semester. Schlereth will be providing a Budget 101 presentation to the USPC to assist in understanding the budget limitations.

Ochoa clarified that the strategic plan isn't meant to micromanage the allocation of budget, it is meant to provide a framework of priorities.

## **VI. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**

(Please see the September 22, 2006 Agenda Packet for related documents)

### Year-End Financial Report: 2005-2006

Though it appears on the year end balance sheet that there was some money left from last year, that money is not actually available. By this time of the year, it has been spent. The \$64,000 from A&F will be going to fund the instructional technology unit. The amount needed was actually \$302,000 and we didn't roll up quite enough so we will need salary savings from this year as well. The \$130,000 University wide item has been depleted because we assessed the divisions for the reserve and have now paid on the reserve.

### President's Budget Allocations: 2006-2007

These are the final budget decisions for 06/07. There is not much material difference in this budget from the one we saw in May. There have been some changes in the Development operation from \$98,000 to \$348,000 due to a recognized need to buttress the Development Office. The compensation shortfall is due to the fact that the 3.6 percent pool is based on the salaries of 2 years ago, which for this year, makes us fall a little short but this is a relatively modest sum. The Athletics shortfall reflects the higher cost of travel and the addition of Humboldt to our conference. Information Technology will be adding an Information Security Officer, an action which was deferred to 06/07 due to the enrollment shortfall. There has been a significant change in campus budget practice. Funds are no longer allocated by marginal cost formula and are allocated by a shared cost formula instead. This is perhaps the most significant budgetary related change in the last three to five years.

### Division Budget Allocations: 2006-2007

The incoming money is the new money allocated to the Division, interest earned on the Revenue Management Program which Coate will speak to at the December meeting and the University-wide allocation for Information Technology. The income from the Revenue Management Program will be used to offset that program. Plant Ops money is restricted for operations. IT money will go to information security. The remaining money will go towards funding the GAAP accountant. The workstation refresh program has fallen short of the \$120,000 needed so the refresh will be deferred to 07/08.

### CSU and Campus Budget Priorities

The budget for the 07/08 year will be proposed by the Trustees in November, the Governor's budget will come out in January and then the campus budget plan will be completed thereafter. There are six big priority areas for the CSU. Campus budget

priorities include Enrollment Growth, Academic Quality, Information Technology and Fundraising. Non-general fund also has a listing of priorities. Of course, it would be better to establish these priorities if the strategic plan was complete, but it isn't, so this year is a limbo year. Next year the budget priorities will be formally based on the strategic plan.

Ochoa added that the CSU is embarking on a system wide strategic plan. Their strategic planning group has determined that the system has made significant progress in seven out of the ten principles in the Cornerstones report and has presented this report to the Trustees. A natural starting point for the new strategic plan would be to take up the unfinished tasks in these principles. The areas of faculty compensation and faculty development need more progress. There should be a greater focus on improving support for faculty to address academic quality. This strategic planning process will probably begin to have an effect in the next budget cycle.

## **VII. GREEN MUSIC CENTER**

### Financial and Construction Update

(Please see the September 22, 2006 Agenda Packet for related documents)

In May, we thought we were out of budget by \$2 million and that we would identify that money in time to sign the contract in September. At the end of August, we were to sign the final contract with the subcontractors of Rudolph & Sletten regarding the final price. The subcontractors' prices trickled in but were coming in much higher than anticipated. After all subcontractor prices had been collected, the contract was \$14 ½ million higher than expected. There was immediate urgency to solve this problem in order to sign the final contract in September so there was not much time for consultation. If the construction contract was not signed on time, we could lose \$12 million in pledges.

So this problem was attacked on two fronts. First we reduced the \$14 million difference by making design changes and pressuring the contractors to reduce their prices. This strategy brought the gap down to about \$10 million. Schlereth thanked Christopher Dinno and Floyd Ross for their contributions in this area. We then added another million to the total for contingency. So then we were short \$11 million. There were only a few solutions available – 1) radically alter the design of the project, particularly the concert hall and faculty office building, 2) get more money or 3) cancel the project. President Armiñana met with Chancellor Reed who was adamant that the project should not be cancelled. We have already raised \$42 million and received an additional \$20 million from the tax payers. Thus, the Chancellor did not see cancelling the project as an option. Any major alterations to the design would have changed the intention of the music program so no one wanted to do that either. So, the decision was made to borrow the needed funds via a Systemwide Revenue Bond. The bond will be just under \$13 million with capitalized interest, which equates to about \$800,000 to be paid back each year. The plan on how to support this debt involves passing the debt back to self supporting areas with interests in actively using the GMC. Extended education is constrained for space for their Lifelong Learning Institute program and other activities and would like to be able to expand. Extended Ed will develop a business plan to increase in revenue by

approximately \$400,000. This will have no effect on the return to Academic Affairs. Administration and Finance will fund the remaining \$400,000 through the creation of a concert series. These concerts will be similar to the Eagles concert last summer and will appeal to the student populations as well as the mass audience of Sonoma County and surrounding regions. This program will be handled by the Conferences, Events and Catering program under Entrepreneurial Activities. Concerts will happen during the academic year at the GMC and the GMC Lobby will also be leased out for special events. It will take six to eight months to develop a business plan. Schlereth would also like to create an advisory subcommittee of the CRC along with community members and donors to assist in thinking this new program through. If anyone is interested, especially members of Res Life, the Student Union, or AS, let Schlereth know of your interest in serving on the subcommittee. This program has a direct connection with the co-curricular life of our students. Schlereth would like to see the program start as early as next summer at a different campus location.

Ochoa added that this provides excellent opportunities for growth for Extended Ed towards the creation of a democratic center for thoughts and ideas that will provide a seamless connection between campus and community through lecture series, conferences, etc.

Schlereth added that this financing plan was approved this week by the Board of Trustees. Schlereth thanked Markley, Coate and Hannah for their exceptional work in creating proformas and other supporting documents in less than three weeks. The Trustees are enthusiastic about the GMC project proceeding and we signed the contract on time.

Schlereth explained that the GMC budget is now higher but in balance. There looks to be a gap of \$1.3 million, but next week there should be an announcement of a donation that will close this gap. A gift has been made but the donor currently wishes to remain anonymous. McNamara asked why the system wide revenue bond is \$18 million. Schlereth responded that that figure includes the bond for the restaurant. Also, this budget does not recognize the hard work of CPDC, accounting and the academic staff who are putting so much work into this project. Their work can be considered to be in-kind contributions.

Ochoa commented that the donors were impressed by the quick response of the University to the shortfall. Additionally, the CSU has made a strong statement that this project will be completed. This may help to reboot the fundraising campaign.

## **VIII. BEAUJOLAIS VILLAGE II: TUSCANY**

Item deferred.

## **IX. UNIVERSITY CENTER**

Item deferred.

## **X. ONE CARD**

Item deferred.

**XI. FACULTY STAFF HOUSING**

Item deferred.

**XII. ENTREPRENEURIAL PRESENTING SEASON**

Item deferred.

**XIII. ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**

Schlereth congratulated Dinno, Rich Marker, Keith Marchando and Harvey DeLorm for receiving \$5,000 from the system to do a lighting retro fit in Stevenson Hall. This will provide energy savings.

Nate Johnson Rich Marker and Dinno have identified the areas on campus to place bike racks. Dinno will provide a map to McDonald so it can be shared with the Academic Senate. Dinno expressed the hope that the Academic Senate would trust their judgment in making these determinations as a lot of time and thought was put into the decision.

Perry Marker announced that Pat Nourot's University service will take place at the Children's Center at 4:30 pm today and everyone is welcome to attend.

Ruth Burke announced the Grand Reopening of Darwin Hall on Friday, September 29<sup>th</sup> from 1 pm to 6 pm that is open to the campus.

Barnard asked that an announcement for Fridays at Four be distributed on Senate Talk.

Schlereth adjourned the meeting at 3:15 pm.

Minutes prepared by Laura Lupei