

**CAMPUS REENGINEERING COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 20, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Chair	Melinda Barnard
Steven Campbell	Letitia Coate
Dan Condron	Katharyn Crabbe
Erik Dickson	Christopher Dinno
Peter Flores	Rheyne Laney for Dolly Freidel
Ian Hannah	Sue Hayes
Tyson Hill	Bill Ingels
Carol Ingerman	Nate Johnson
Susan Kashack	Mike Kiraly
Paul Lange	Laura Lupei
Perry Marker	Rich Marker
Neil Markley	Meri Storino for Elaine McDonald
Bennett Hall for Charles Mikulik	Gloria Ogg
Tom Ormond	Janice Peterson
Katie Pierce	Anna Reynolds
Floyd Ross	Vincent Richman for Elizabeth Stanny
Andrew Sloan	Tim Tiemens
Nadir Vissanjy	Tim Wandling
Jason Wenrick	Xiaodong Zhu

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ruth Burke	Jenifer Crist
Lori Heffernon	Kelley Kaslar
Rick Ludmerer	Robert McNamara
Peter Neville	Eduardo Ochoa
Chuck Rhodes	Sam Scalise
Erica Wilcher	

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. TEXT BOOK ORDERING DATE**
- VI. DEFERRED MAINTENANCE**
- VII. STRATEGIC PLANNING**
- VIII. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**
- IX. BIKE RACKS**
- X. CELL PHONES**
- XI. BEAUJOLAIS VILLAGE II: TUSCANY**
- XII. GREEN MUSIC CENTER SRB II DEBT SERVICE**
- XIII. ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

September 22, 2006

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth called the meeting to order at 12:10 pm. Schlereth asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2005 meeting. Letitia Coate moved; Floyd Ross seconded. No objections or changes were heard and the minutes were approved unanimously with abstentions from those who were not in attendance at the September meeting.

II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT

CMS Search

Schlereth announced the members of the search committee that have been identified for the Senior Director for CMS position. Two students and two faculty members still need to be assigned to the committee. The committees will begin meeting on the first of November. Laura Lupei will serve as staff to this search committee.

CPDC Search

All of the staff members have been identified for the CPDC Senior Director search. The goal for both positions is to have them filled by the close of the semester. Ian Hannah will serve as staff to this search committee.

University Center Update

The University Planning Committee has been meeting and an architect has been selected. Christopher Dinno added that the planning committee group is very excited. It has been a long process and the kick-off meeting occurred yesterday to begin working on the programming process. Schlereth asked Dinno to bring the program to CRC as it develops.

Fridays at Four

There will be a Fridays at Four reception directly after the CRC. Schlereth encouraged all members to attend.

III. CAMPUS CONSULTATION

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

Schlereth provided a hand out with eleven questions to consider to assist him in defining the consultative process. The Bookstore issue has indicated that we may need to work on our consultative process and come to a common understanding and shared agreement about the rules of engagement. Schlereth would like the committee to provide feedback on these questions and give a sense of campus sentiment and he will bring a consultation statement to the next CRC.

Do we permit proxies?

The practice has been to allow proxies. Sue Hayes does not believe that we should allow them. Gloria Ogg agreed because if someone is sitting on the committee as a proxy, they have not heard the previous discussions on a topic. Mike Kiraly argued that proxies should be allowed because getting the information back from the meeting is very helpful. If he misses a meeting, he can read the minutes, but can't get all the details and nuances from the minutes. Perhaps proxies should be allowed, but not allowed to vote. Ogg responded that if she misses a meeting, she feels that it is her responsibility to go to the other members to get information on what was discussed. Schlereth said that his instinct is to not allow proxies. Perry Marker noted that the proxy issue is at the heart of the consultation issue. Allowing proxies allows for better communication. The representative should instruct the proxy on the issues and how to vote and then get information back from them after the meeting. Perhaps we should even establish some sort of absence rule because members have a responsibility to attend on a regular basis. Nate Johnson added that it is important for us to determine first, what roles a proxy is to play and whether or not they have voting rights.

What does consultation mean?

Schlereth provided a brief history of the CRC. Discussion ensued regarding the role of the CRC as a consultative device, whether the committee should be advisory or legislative and how it is decided what issues are brought to the committee. Most committee members agreed that the Vice-President should make the decision to bring issues to CRC for which he would like to hear advice from diverse viewpoints and perspectives. However, the final decisions rest with the VP and the committee should play an advisory role rather than a decision making role. Some members requested that the agendas be sent out ahead of time and Schlereth responded that this is difficult to do but would be considered.

Schlereth asked the committee then if it considered to be an advisory group, should he come back and inform them of the decision that has been made and provide an explanation. The committee was supportive of this idea. The committee then discussed whether or not votes should be taken. Most members agreed that for an advisory committee, straw votes would provide a sense of the feelings of the committee without mandating a specific decision. The committee then agreed that Robert's rules of order should not be followed. Schlereth asked the committee how they felt about the first and second reading concept. The committee generally agreed that it was sometimes helpful

but sometimes unnecessary and only useful if time allows. Schlereth asked if he should bring a solution for an issue to the committee or come to the committee with just the issue for help with new ideas. The committee generally agreed that bringing a proposed solution provided a good starting point and that an alternate decision may still come out of the group.

Schlereth then raised the issue of committee jurisdiction on campus. Can SSU define the jurisdiction of which groups get to consult on which things? He feels that other committees shouldn't be able to weigh in on the issues that lie in separate committees jurisdictions. The campus should determine which issues go to which bodies and then the other committees need to let those issues go and trust that the committee with jurisdiction will resolve the issue appropriately. Schlereth will raise this issue at the Academic Executive Council. The campus must solve this question before moving forward with a common understanding of what consultation means. There is no reason to maintain the CRC if the committee does not have standing. Discussion ensued regarding the need for clarification of committee jurisdiction and effective communication on campus.

Schlereth asked if the committee thought that CRC was too large. The consensus of the committee was that it is a very large group, but this provides good diversity of viewpoints.

Schlereth thanked the committee for their feedback and will write a draft statement and bring it to the next meeting for review.

IV. CAMPUS STORE REVIEW GROUP

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

The committee was asked to review the charge for the campus store review group that was distributed at the previous meeting and be prepared to provide feedback. Schlereth reminded the committee that the Division of Administration and Finance is currently undergoing an assessment process in order to demonstrate to WASC that we are both educationally and administratively effective. WASC regulations require this effectiveness to be documented through a body of evidence and the Division is assessing two or three areas per year. So, the assessment of Barnes and Noble will take place outside of the campus store review group as well as we need to document for WASC that this methodology of textbook delivery is effective. However, Schlereth has told the Academic Senate that he will proceed with this assessment through the campus store review group. The student body doesn't want to rehash the decision, but feel that this review should be an assessment for the future. Tim Wandling agrees that this group should be forward looking and should consider the questions of sustainability and educational value that are embedded in the University mission statement and to ensure that we are aligning our institutional practices with our educational mission. Wandling urges the committee to support what he believes is an important process. Neil Markley reiterated his hope that whatever findings come out of this group will be accepted. He would expect the Academic Senate and the CRC to support the recommendations that

come out of this review group. Wandling responded that it is impossible to control the individual or body, but he believes there would be a lot of understanding for the issues. Schlereth said that he would tell the Academic Senate that the review group will go through with this process and if they disagree with the results, that is unfortunate, but the findings of the review group will stand. Additionally, Schlereth would like to incorporate the issue of how outsourcing affects our campus into the charge since he believes it will be a recurring issue. Wandling suggested condensing the membership for the committee.

Schlereth will return to the Academic Senate and discuss the suggested changes for the charge as well as potentially reducing the committee down to eight members.

V. TEXT BOOK ORDERING DATE

Schlereth has put this issue on the agenda to receive advice from the committee on what to recommend to the Provost and Barnes and Noble. The issue is that the textbook ordering date that Barnes and Noble would like to set is earlier than the date we have traditionally used at SSU. The earlier date would give us higher access to textbooks. Should we move the date to get better access to the used textbook market or stick with the old date? Melinda Barnard noted that part of the problem is the cumbersome ordering process. If the deadline is going to be earlier, information needs to be better distributed and the process should be easier. Also, repeat course ordering should be straightforward, but those who are teaching different courses and part-time lecturers can't order by that deadline because the courses aren't determined and the lecturers aren't hired. Markley responded that he would look into the ordering process and see if there is a way to simplify it. Additionally, Barnes and Noble should be teaching faculty how to do the process and answering questions involved. This did not happen this semester because of the set backs involved with the contract delay. Markley also wanted to make a clarification regarding the annual list that is published by the Associated Students. The AS annually publishes a list of the faculty that has met the text book deadline. This year, the old deadline will be used to generate the names for that list.

Hayes added that she would like to know that there is a classroom scheduled before she has to order the books. Wandling said that this is an example of consultation flowing the other way. It is clear that the business processes in the departments of scheduling, hiring, assigning space, etc, need to happen better. We should be structured so that cases when orders can't be put in early are the exception rather than the rule. Katharyn Crabbe agreed and said that it is time for us to examine the business processes by which we do our scheduling. Some of this issue is administrative and some of this is on the faculty side. She will do as much as she can to make this early ordering work. Hayes added that the students who are admitted also drive the courses we provide so this will affect the recruitment process as well. Schlereth said that he is hearing that everyone would like us to do what we can to meet the earlier deadline to get more used textbooks but business processes need to be addressed. Schlereth will discuss this with Eduardo Ochoa. Meri Storino also requested more advanced notice for the deadline. Markley suggested creating a focus group of faculty to discuss improvements to the ordering process. Hayes added that we should use our partnership with Barnes and Noble to put pressure on the publishers about the problem of constant new editions. Markley noted that this first

controversy with Barnes and Noble was about their attempt to save the students money, so that is a good thing. Nadir Vissanjy asked if our non-compliance with the earlier date will affect the used textbook percentage in the contract. Markley replied that they are willing to adapt to our particular campus and they agreed to the used textbook percentage knowing that the earlier deadline would not be strictly adhered to right away.

VI. DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Item deferred.

VII. STRATEGIC PLANNING

Division Strategic Plan: Activities in 2006-2007 – UPDATE

Item deferred.

VIII. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

Budget 101 Time Certain 2 PM

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

Schlereth announced that he would provide a presentation entitled Budget 101 to give the committee an overview of the campus budgeting process. President Armiñana thought it would be a good idea in the climate of strategic planning, to give a primer on budget in order to assist with decisions. More detailed information is available in the Expenditure Plan Booklet. Schlereth thanked Janice Peterson for her excellent work on our budget and then provided the presentation.

IX. BIKE RACKS

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

The locations of the bike racks were determined by Christopher Dinno, Richard Marker and Nate Johnson. Dinno outlined the changes and additions to the bike racks on campus. He clarified that these locations are chosen keeping in mind the guidelines limiting the locations of bike racks. He added that the bike racks are there, they just aren't being used properly. Schlereth said that the Academic Senate still doesn't feel that there are enough bike racks, so should the CRC create an ad hoc committee to address this issue? Hayes responded that she thought there was already a committee in tasked with this responsibility and Johnson said that it is the Alternative Transportation Subcommittee. Johnson added that this is an on-going assessment, not just a one time change. Wandling noted that it sounds as if the issue is being appropriately addressed and there is no need for an additional committee. Questions were also raised regarding bicycle use and skateboarding on campus and Johnson clarified that the Alternative Vehicle Use Policy covers these areas and that violations are subject to fines per a SSU code created by Sonoma County's Traffic Court. Schlereth will take this information back to the Academic Senate and let them know that the issue is being addressed by the Alternative Transportation Committee.

X. CELL PHONES

Item deferred.

XI. BEAUJOLAIS VILLAGE II: TUSCANY

Housing Proposal Review Committee Document
(Please see the September 22, 2006 Agenda Packet for related documents)

On November 15th, the Tuscany Housing Proposal will be presented to the system-wide Housing Proposal Review Committee. This is a committee composed of peer campuses who will review our proposal for a new housing project. This is a first reading of the proposal and Schlereth would like to take formal action at the next meeting.

Tim Tiemens explained the history of this housing project. In 2001 the entire Beaujolais Village project was put forward and approved by the Housing Proposal Review Committee and the Board of Trustees. It was approved in two phases. Phase I was constructed and opened on schedule in 2003. Before beginning Phase II, another review was performed. A demand study done in 2003 determined that the enrollment projections showed demand for the housing. The Housing Proposal Review Committee again approved Phase II. At about that time, the CSU experienced a downturn in budgets and the decision was made to put Phase II on hold until budgets and enrollments improve. Now in 2006, the budget is restored and enrollment is back up and climbing. The composition of the Housing Proposal Review Committee changes every two years so it will be a new group that reviews this proposal.

We currently have several different styles of student housing on campus. The housing was intentionally built that way in order to accommodate the developmental needs of various types of students. Housing for freshman should emphasize community, for older students, the emphasis is on privacy. The delay in this phase of housing has given us more time to analyze what we would like to do with this new village. The design will enable us to house freshmen if we need to, place returning residents in another segment of the village and it would even be appropriate for faculty and staff if we ever need to go in that direction. The demand study from 2006 shows demand based mostly on increased enrollment. Most of these students are coming from outside of the commuting area. Additionally, there is demand from first year students who want to live on campus for their second year. This project will be financed by state revenue bonds which will be paid off by Housing revenues. The Housing Program also pays back overhead costs to the General Fund. Dinno provided a diagram of the location of the project. The village will be comprised of six buildings in clusters similar to those in Sauvignon Village. It will be a hybrid townhouse/apartment complex with interior stairs. The Village would house almost 700 residents in 114 units with two doubles and two singles within a 1500 square foot unit. There will be a multi-purpose community building on site. This project will require the removal of the eucalyptus trees along East Cotati Avenue which are a danger. One alternative is to replant and formalize that edge of campus. The plan is to go out with an RFP at the end of October, with the opening in Fall 09.

Melinda Barnard expressed deep reservations about the design of the building. If the focus is supposed to be on freshman, she doesn't understand how building more

apartments with kitchens is going to handle our increase in freshmen. Sauvignon Village seems isolated and lonely for the freshman. Focus on freshman. These new units don't seem to be flexible to adapt to freshman.

Tiemens replied that, in fact, Sauvignon is in high demand from incoming freshmen. Apartment style living does pose a larger challenge to socializing new students, and our Residential Life staff does a good job of recognizing and addressing this. Our dorm suites are structured in a similar way, just without the kitchen. Today's freshman does not want the traditional dorm living with shared bathrooms and long hallways.

Schlereth said that the challenge lies in matching the students' wants to the need to create a sense of community. This challenge underscores the need for the University Center. The weakness in Sauvignon is that there is no village center. Crabbe added that the other part of the plan that is important in addressing these issues is the public space available for programming. Perry Marker asked why we have departed from the high rise concept used in Beaujolais Phase I since it seems to be a more efficient use of space. Tiemens replied that originally the second phase was supposed to be the same as the first. However, that design is better for an older student with an emphasis on privacy. With the new design, there is a better facilitation of interaction. Schlereth added that in focus groups, Sauvignon Village tends to be the most popular with students. Perry Marker then asked if this is the last planned phase of student housing. Schlereth responded that it is the only phase that is on the master plan. We will again be short on housing space after 2010, but we will have to have the master plan changed before adding any more housing. Peter Flores said that as a former student on campus, he felt that the interaction on campus was more valuable in the dorm areas than the apartments so with the increasing amount of freshman in Sauvignon may cause a problem and that there should be a consideration of revamping the old dorms instead. Markley responded that the students constantly rate Sauvignon very highly and that was one of the reasons that this new design was decided upon. Tyson Hill added that freshman are required to buy a meal plan whether they live in a dorm or an apartment, so that can assist with the socialization.

XII. GREEN MUSIC CENTER SRB II DEBT SERVICE

Entrepreneurial Services

Item deferred.

XIII. ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER

Perry Marker complimented the lighting improvement in Parking Lot A.

Schlereth adjourned the meeting at 4:04 pm

Minutes prepared by Laura Lupei.