

**CAMPUS REENGINEERING COMMITTEE  
DECEMBER 1, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Chair	Melinda Barnard
Ruth Burke	Steven Campbell
Letitia Coate	Dan Condron
Jenifer Crist	Christopher Dinno
Peter Flores	Dolly Freidel
Ian Hannah	Sue Hayes
Lori Heffernon	Tyson Hill
Carol Ingerman	Nate Johnson
Susan Kashack	Kelley Kaslar
Mike Kiraly	Paul Lange
Rick Ludmerer	Laura Lupei
Neil Markley	Elaine McDonald
Robert McNamara	Charles Mikulik
Peter Neville	Gloria Ogg
Janice Peterson	Katie Pierce
Anna Reynolds	Chuck Rhodes
Vincent Richman for Elizabeth Stanny	Floyd Ross
Andrew Sloan	Tim Tiemens
Nadir Vissanjy	Jason Wenrick

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Katharyn Crabbe	Erik Dickson
Bill Ingels	Perry Marker
Rich Marker	Eduardo Ochoa
Tom Ormond	Sam Scalise
Tim Wandling	Erica Wilcher
Xiaodong Zhu	

GUESTS PRESENT:

Dee Dee Brannan

**AGENDA**

- I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
- II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
- III. CAMPUS CONSULTATION**
- IV. CAMPUS REVIEW GROUP**
- V. MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM**

- VI. CELL PHONES, E-MAIL, INTERNET USE**
- VII. DEFERRED MAINTENANCE**
- VIII. STRATEGIC PLANNING**
- IX. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**
- X. GREEN MUSIC CENTER UPDATE**
- XI. ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**

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

October 20, 2006

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth called the meeting to order at 12:10 pm. Schlereth announced that the Senior Directors were having lunch with one of the CPDC candidates and would join CRC after the lunch was finished. Schlereth also announced that the committee would be having an unusual lunch today, which would be further explained by Nate Johnson. Johnson introduced Tyson Hill as the Management Trainee working on the emergency preparedness program. Today we will be served the self-heating emergency ration meals that Hill has procured. The Emergency Preparedness Program has provided the orange emergency packs across campus, distributed flashlights, ran emergency drills and now the emphasis is on the training portion. This year, Hill has trained about 350 campus personnel. So, the lunch today will give the committee a taste of what will be provided in the case of an emergency.

Schlereth also announced that today's meeting will end around 3:15 pm to allow members to attend the open forum for the CPDC candidate.

Schlereth called for a motion to approve the minutes of the October 20, 2006 meeting. Mike Kiraly moved; Sue Hayes 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.

Schlereth noted that a rough draft of the CRC agenda was sent out ahead of time as requested at the last meeting and that he will continue to provide this ahead of time.

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

### Textbook Ordering Date

At the last meeting there was a discussion about whether or not to move up the book order deadline in order to allow the Bookstore to procure more used books. However, now it appears that the technology accessibility initiative, which requires all textbooks to be accessible to those with disabilities on the first day of class, will probably require that the book order deadline move up. All the materials for a course need to be prepared much in advance of the semester, which will have the positive benefit of allowing the bookstore to get more used books.

### Technology Accessibility

For Administration and Finance, the technology accessibility initiative requires that every website and all materials posted on our websites must be accessible for persons with disabilities. An audit of all of our websites is being done by Peter Flores under the direction of Jason Wenrick. If a website is not accessible by December 21<sup>st</sup>, it will be taken offline. The only exception is the PeopleSoft websites because they need to be made accessible by Oracle and this will be done through a system-wide initiative. The implementation of this technology accessibility initiative is much simpler in Administration and Finance, so Schlereth is confident that this can be completed in a timely manner.

### Tuscany

The Housing Expansion Proposal was presented at the last Board of Trustees meeting and a letter arrived today announcing that the proposal has been approved. Schlereth thanked Tim Tiemens and his team for preparing an outstanding presentation to the peer review group. We are waiting for bids to be open on this phase of housing, which are expected at the end of January.

### Senior Director Searches

There are currently two searches for Senior Director positions underway, for the CMS and CPDC Senior Director positions. Both searches will be complete by December 20<sup>th</sup>. Schlereth thanked the Associated Students and Academic Senate for providing student and faculty representatives on the search committees. There are good pools for both positions and it will be a difficult decision for the committees, but Schlereth is confident that we will be successful in finding two excellent candidates.

### Parking Lot A Lighting

Schlereth continues to receive compliments on the lighting in parking lot A and he expressed his thanks to Rich Marker and Johnson for their contributions to that project. There will most likely be updates to the lighting in all of the parking lots as money comes in from parking revenues. Lighting is usually a major issue in the CRC but there has not been as much discussion this year, probably because of these improvements.

### Human Services Assessment

The Human Services assessment is well underway. At the February CRC meeting Schlereth will bring forward a fairly provocative recommendation for significant changes in the way our human services department works. The report from the consultants should come in next week, it will be presented to the President for review and Schlereth will recommend that it then comes to the CRC for review. He has been working closely with the consultants who have been assessing the department, conducting interviews with the employees and focus groups of customers. The proposed changes will be fairly significant and will probably occupy a significant part of our time and energy in the Spring.

### Beaujolais Trees

The trees that line the corridor from the street to the fountains in Beaujolais Village are diseased and will need to be removed because they pose a danger. They will be replaced with red oak trees which are native to this area.

#### 40 Year Recognition

This committee provided a recommendation for a 40 Year Recognition Bench that was sent to the CPC, which has approved the project. However, the location has moved from between the Commons and Student Union to the McCabe Plaza in Schulz. This change was made because it is a more permanent location and a major thoroughfare. The project will begin this summer.

#### Rohnert Park Sewage Contract

In 1964 SSU entered into a contract with the city of Rohnert Park to take our sewage through their sewage lines. The contract was renegotiated and re-signed in 1978 and again in 1980 and the current one that is in effect goes into perpetuity. The contract allows for 250,000 gallons of sewage per day into the RP pipes and if we go over this amount for more than five consecutive days, then we are in violation of the contract. Building the student housing expansion will cause us to go over this limit so we would like to increase our capacity in the contract to address this growth. While we are renegotiating the contract, we would like to determine what level we would need to get the campus to 10,000 full time students. However, Rohnert Park has let us know that they don't have enough capacity to accommodate our increase, but they are currently expanding their capacity and if we pay our part of \$18 million, we may have the additional capacity. So, since this is not financially feasible, we are back to considering adding on capacity on a project by project basis. So our housing project then may have some additional costs because of the sewage issue. These costs are directly related to student residents so it will most likely be folded into the student license fees. However, the argument may be made with the city that if these students didn't live on campus, they would live in Rohnert Park anyway. This issue may play out in the newspaper.

Dolly Freidel asked about the effects that the GMC would have on the sewage capacity. Schlereth responded that the GMC doesn't produce that much sewage because most of the sewage volume comes from the residents. Also, the GMC performances will be on the weekends when we are well below our sewage limit anyway. We will try to address this issue through a focus on sustainability and conservation as well. Nadir Vissanjy asked about the effects of the Supreme Court City of Marina case on our campus. Schlereth responded that it won't really affect us because it only applies to new projects. All new projects with environmental impact require that the entity pay for part of the mitigating cost. However, all of our current projects, with the exception of Faculty/Staff Housing, were approved in the May 2004 Master Plan. But for the sewage capacity, our utility contract will probably trump the Supreme Court case. Andrew Sloan asked if there has been a discussion to reduce water use and education regarding conservation. Schlereth responded that we have done a lot of retrofitting but we do have room to improve in that area. Sloan added that there is a campus club called Green Campus which conducts educational activities to promote conservation and sustainability, so if they could get more support, it could be a good way to push the education piece.

Schlereth responded that this education component will likely be a major initiative for the new Senior Director of CPDC. Freidel suggested incorporating it into the Freshmen Seminar. Vissanjy asked if these issues will be addressed in the student housing expansion. Christopher Dinno responded that the new project will be required to meet all of the new mandates by the Chancellor's Office that addresses these concerns.

### **III. CAMPUS CONSULTATION**

#### **Proposed Guidelines for CRC**

(Please refer to the December 1, 2006 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth reviewed the proposed consultation principles that he provided to the committee and then asked the committee to provide feedback. Peter Neville addressed the item on voting to clarify that when a vote is taken, it is still considered to be advisory in nature and that in order to communicate this, and phrase should be changed to "straw votes" in the guidelines. Melinda Barnard argued the opposite view, that taking votes is a way to commit the representatives to taking a stand during difficult decisions, especially in difficult budgetary and reengineering decisions. Symbolically, the voting is important because it denotes more of a sense of responsibility so that members recognize what they are supporting. Sue Hayes agreed that not always having a formal vote is sensible because there is usually a general consensus of the committee. However, on a tight issue, those feelings need to be publicized.

Robert McNamara addressed the allowance of proxies. He expressed concern for members who have other professional commitments that require that they miss this meeting. Schlereth responded that the primary argument against proxies is that they are coming into the meeting without full knowledge of the matter and miss the ongoing dialogue. Elaine McDonald thinks that this is a good point, but when she had to send a proxy to the last meeting, she spent quite a bit of time talking with the proxy in advance to get her up to date and communicate her feelings on the upcoming issues. McDonald asked if proxies aren't allowed, is the meeting still considered open and what are the rules regarding members of the community attending these meetings. Schlereth responded that, from his perspective, all meetings are open meetings and that guests will be recognized if they have something to say. Charles Mikulik added that as a student representative it is his responsibility to participate in this committee and he would be doing a disservice if he couldn't have someone take his place if he couldn't attend. This is also a good opportunity to send a possible predecessor.

Schlereth determined that since most of the time there is committee consensus and an occasional vote, he will delete the section about voting. The item on proxies will be changed to "proxies are not permitted, but representatives are welcome". McDonald agreed with that language and added that it should read the short-term proxies are not allowed, but long-term proxies are allowed. Vissanjy proposed changing the second to last bullet point to be split into two separate bullet points.

Vissanjy asked if the CRC minutes could be sent out to the Senate Talk list serve. Schlereth responded that the faculty may post the minutes if they wish but that would be a faculty member's responsibility.

Schlereth asked for a vote on the modified consultation principles and the principles passed unanimously with no abstentions.

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

Financial, Social and Ecological Implications of Outsourcing Review Group  
Membership

(Please refer to the December 1, 2006 agenda packet for related documents)

The Campus Review Group originated as the Bookstore Review Commission but, consequent to discussions in this committee, the scope has been broadened. Associated Students will choose the student members, Academic senate will appoint the faculty members and the President will appoint staff and administrator members. Vissanjy asked if the appointing parties could be added to the charge and Schlereth agreed. Schlereth will meet with Art Warmouth on Monday regarding this charge.

Schlereth asked for a motion to approve the charge. Carol Ingerman moved; Andrew Sloan seconded. Neville opposes, McNamara, Johnson and Vincent Richman abstained. All other members voted aye and the charge was approved.

#### **V. MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM**

(Please refer to the December 1, 2006 agenda packet for related documents)

There have been some issues that have come up with the Management Training Program. There is a discrepancy in timing from the time the candidates were applying to be in the program and applying to the graduate program. By the time we appoint them in the Management Training Program it is too late to admit them in the graduate program of their choice. This has caused some bad feelings with the academic programs, who are supportive of the program but don't want to give special treatment to the trainees. Schlereth met with Carol Blackshire-Belay, Elaine Leeder, Katharyn Crabbe and David McCuan and came up with a timeline to equate application to the program with application to the graduate programs. When we offer the candidate a position in the program, they will already be notified of the admission to a graduate program.

Schlereth reviewed the timeline that was included in the agenda packet. McDonald asked if trainees take the place of other cohorts in the programs and Schlereth clarified that management trainee applicants must compete for their place in the program against all other applicants. Peter Flores expressed concern with the timeline not allowing ample time to complete the GMAT for MBA students. Hayes added that the programs will usually admit pending results of the GMAT test. Schlereth added that the idea is to make campus employees aware of the timeline and the process. The applicant must be motivated, prepared and organized in order to complete the requirements to get into the program.

Mikulik inquired into the requirements for the position and the time commitment for the trainee. Schlereth responded that the requirements were that the candidate be a non-faculty, non-management, full time employee of the university with an undergraduate degree, eligible to be admitted to a Masters program in Business Administration, Education or Public Administration. Once the trainee is hired, they have three academic years to complete the degree and work full time during the program. The university pays the full cost of the educational component of the program, including books. If the trainees fail the program, they lose their jobs. If they fail the annual performance process, they can also be fired as at will employees.

Vissanjy asked if the timeline should work around the May re-write of the Governor's budget. Schlereth responded that the decision is also based on a projection of retirements and workforce patterns. The Senior Directors have been asked if they would like a trainee for next year, but they will need to pay for the position out of their department budgets.

## **VI. CELL PHONES, E-MAIL, INTERNET USE**

This item relates to University employees using these devices for personal use. California law says that resources that are owned by the state cannot be used for personal purposes. The issue comes up primarily for cell phones. The Chancellor's Office says that we need to write a policy on cell phone use regarding cell phones that have been purchased by the University for use by employees. There are two general strategies to follow for this policy and Schlereth would like to get a sense of where the campus feeling is on this issue. First, the user of the cell phone can get the bill and identify all calls which were personal and reimburse the University for all of those calls. However, most people are on a plan, so if they don't go over their minutes, how should the cost of the personal calls be broken down. The IRS regulation says that the cost per minute for the minutes on the plan needs to be divided out and then the University needs to be reimbursed for that amount of money that was time spent on personal calls, regardless of whether or not all of the free minutes were used. These will then be sent to accounting to be audited. Dolly Freidel said that the personal call probably cost five cents and with all the time and money that is being sent to reimburse and audit the process, it is ridiculous. Hayes mentioned that, if that is the case, employees should be reimbursed when they use their personal phones for University business. Schlereth agreed that there are major problems with that strategy so he explained the San Diego State University plan. A decision is made by the appropriate administrator that an employee needs a phone. It is determined how much that would cost and a stipend is supplied to the employee. The check is taxable, but the phone is considered to be personal and calls aren't subject to the Public Records Act. This plan is much simpler. The cell phone question is primarily an issue for administrators and personnel who need to be on call in IT and Facilities. Hayes noted that the second strategy makes more sense from a cost/benefit perspective. Schlereth asked Paul Lange for his opinion, since he would be directly affected by this policy. Lange replied that he would prefer the second strategy, because they are already being required to reimburse on personal calls and it is a cumbersome process. Mike Kiraly pointed out that if the stipend is taxable, the employee is carrying a higher degree of the cost, and if they go over their plan, they are responsible for the extra cost even if it

is business related. Another option is to determine that business phones cannot be used for personal use and people can carry two phones. Schlereth added that this concern has been raised in response to a Whistleblower action investigation. The University needs to provide guidance to employees in this area. Vissanjy noted that the stipend is tax deductible on your personal taxes. McDonald added that this issue should be raised at the Academic Senate. Barnard mentioned that if these phones are going to be used for both personal and business purposes, then employees who are on call must be held responsible to answer them at all times. Lori Heffernon mentioned that faculty members in Grants and Contracts use business phones but they only use them during office hours, how would that work with the 24/7 on call requirement? Schlereth responded that the Dean or appropriate administrator would have to make the call of who requires a business phone. Schlereth added that this policy is subject to collective bargaining. Vissanjy explained that the Associated Students has a similar system; he purchases his own phone and pays the bill and the AS pays him a monthly stipend for a portion of the bill. Rick Ludmerer added that from the perspective of personal privacy issues, the stipend provides the least intrusive strategy.

Schlereth concluded that there was a general consensus among the committee for the stipend so he will draft a general policy and bring it to the next meeting.

Schlereth asked the committee what their feeling was regarding issuing a statement reminding employees that the internet at SSU is a publicly owned resource that is not to be used for personal purposes. The email and internet is supposed to be used only for official business. Kiraly asked if there was already a blue paper policy regulating the use of the network and Schlereth responded that Sam Scalise has a written policy but it isn't a blue paper policy. Personal purposes can be broken down into two categories: personal use and personal gain. Perhaps the policy statement should differentiate between the two. No use of email or internet for personal gain, but personal use in moderation is acceptable. McNamara noted that our campus is not unique in this problem and is it really necessary to create a campus policy since we are legally required to follow the CSU policy, even though nobody does. In the CSU policy the network is not used for personal use at all. Schlereth responded that the CSU policy is very restrictive and not very practical. The campus policy would take the accountability off of the employees and place it on the administration that would be held responsible for misinterpreting the law. Ludmerer added that the auditor's policy is vague and open to interpretation. The one who gets hurt is the employee who had no guidance. Ultimately the policy is designed to protect the employee. Gloria Ogg asked if we do put together a policy, would there be follow up to determine if the policy was being followed or would we wait for another Whistleblower action? Schlereth responded that we would mostly likely write the policy and then hope that people follow it, just as we do with most of our policies. Ogg replied that her concern was that if we don't monitor the policy, it won't hold up. Barnard said that we should be challenging this policy instead of trying to work around it. This is trying to take a business rule and adapt it to a 24 hour educational facility. Also, is it discriminatory to say that students and guests can use the network for personal use but employees can't? Freidel added that it might be difficult to draw the line between personal gain and university related work for faculty. Letitia Coate said it is

clear from the auditor's perspective is if they believe you have used state resources, such as the computer or the network, for personal gain, this is a violation of state law. Each case may be different, but they've ruled very strictly there. Also, anything that is communicated in email from this university is considered to be property of the university and can be pulled in an audit without asking the employee. Hayes suggested that we provide an interpretation rather than a policy statement. Schlereth agreed that this statement would be a series of guidelines for university employees defining areas that the law has not defined and offering clarification. McDonald added that there should be a distinction between personal gain and professional gain. Professional gain helps the university and should be allowable under this policy guideline. Mikulik asked for a draft of a policy to work from so that the discussion may be more focused. Schlereth asked if the committee would like him to draft something or just leave the issue alone. Chuck Rhodes supports the idea of drafting a policy. With the amount of confusion among the forty people on the committee, it shows how confusing the issue must be to the thousands of people on campus. He added that professional gain isn't just limited to faculty but also applies to other employees of the university. Schlereth will draft something for the internet policy and will continue to work on the cell phone issue.

## **VII. DEFERRED MAINTENANCE**

(Please refer to the December 1, 2006 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth discussed the deferred maintenance item list provided in the packet. Items are broken down by fund and the total cost is around \$22 million, which is not really that bad. Some of these issues will be addressed in the discussion about the Five Year Capital Outlay Program. There will be some money coming from the system related to minor capital outlay in the \$400,000 range. These items are also listed in priority order based on safety issues. ADA issues are at the top of the list, instruction needs follow that. Freidel asked about the plans regarding projects at the Commons and the Student Union. Schlereth replied that there needs to be a decision about what the campus is going to do with those buildings before we make these decisions. The Campus Planning Committee needs to do a study to determine the future of these buildings. This list is really for information only.

Barnard would like to see item #51 moved further up on the list because of safety concerns and Rhodes expressed his agreement. Schlereth asked Johnson to consider if this item and other items could be moved to the alternate transportation or parking funds.

## **VIII. STRATEGIC PLANNING**

Division Strategic Plan: Activities in 2006-2007 – UPDATE  
(Please refer to the December 1, 2006 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth provided an update on the status of the goals, objectives and initiatives in the Division Strategic Plan. The Division continues to move forward on the strategic plan. There is still no agreement on objectives for the campus wide strategic plan, the goal is to have a first draft ready early in the spring semester. McNamara asked if the instruction technology initiatives include the new disability requirements. Schlereth responded that there may be some funding coming from the CSU to meet these new requirements.

Otherwise, this will become an unfunded mandate to the campuses, but will emerge as a highest priority technology need because of the legislation.

## **IX. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**

(Please refer to the December 1, 2006 agenda packet for related documents)

### Trustees Proposed Budget: 2007-2008

Schlereth reviewed the Board of Trustees Report on the Support Budget provided in the agenda packet. The request is for almost \$267 million additional dollars. This is in accordance with the compact and the general feeling is that the Governor will comply with the compact. We receive 350 additional FTES of the 8351 FTES enrollment growth. The marginal cost formula right now is at \$9100 per FTES which would be truly remarkable. This year it was only \$8300. The increase is primarily in recognition of higher costs of faculty and benefits. CFA has settled with CSU for the prior year SSI's for about \$6 million dollars and the funding source for that needs to be determined. Our cost may be around \$150,000 based on eligibility of SSU faculty. A truer estimate should be available in a few days. Katie Pierce noted that the number of eligible faculty on our campus isn't that high. Schlereth addressed the additional issues surrounding the compensation pool. The current budget for this year is 3.6 percent, but if what is negotiated with the unions is higher, we have to make up the difference. This is the first time we have ever chosen to pay higher salary increases than what were are being given for the compensation pool and it represents a new unfunded cost. Pierce added that we have already committed funds to the Spring schedule so the opportunities to make up the cost in salary savings are extremely limited because students are already enrolled in the classes. This issue is coming up very late in the fiscal year and we need to get cost projections so we can plan. McNamara is worried about the way the issue is being presented, that the closing of the salary gap is 'coming out of the hide' of the university. Schlereth responded that this is the situation we are being placed in. The Trustees are making closing the salary gap a high priority but are no longer funding it and are leaving it to the campuses to fund. Schlereth believes that the increase in salaries will parallel an increase in workload because we will be able to afford fewer positions.

### Five Year Capital Outlay Program

Item deferred.

### Grants and Contracts A-133 Audit

KPMG performed the annual A-133 audit which is an audit of federal funds. They found certain expenditures that were not authorized for reimbursement from the federal government because proper contracting and procurement guidelines were not followed. These findings were mostly in CIHS which has delegated contract and procurement authority from the University. The disallowances total approximately \$300,000 that will not be reimbursed from the federal government. This will have a dramatic impact on CIHS. Our Contracts and Procurement office is not taking responsibility for this area and a new staff person will be needed to handle the increased workload. CIHS and our finance team are working hard to resolve this issue. There will be findings on the A-133 audit which is not a good thing. Ruth Burke asked where the funding for the new

Contracts and Procurement position will come from and Schlereth responded that it will probably come from the IDC.

#### Grants and Contracts State Pro-Rata Charges

Pro-rata charges are imposed upon University self-supporting funds for services provided by the State of California that need to be reimbursed and retirement health care benefits. Retirement health care benefits are a costly benefit in the CSU. For example, the Housing Program is assessed for the cost of the post retirement benefits. This year, the Grants and Contracts program is also being assessed for these charges. They have not had to pay this pro-rata charge in the past but the state has caught up with them. This will be about \$850,000 in charges for this year which has not been factored into the Grants and Contracts budget. They are attempting to re-write this cost into the direct costs in the grants, but these are retroactive changes. It is unlikely that the cost will be covered by these retroactive contract additions, so this will need to be paid from the reserves in the 06/07 year. This wipes out the fund balance of CIHS, ASC and Grants and Contracts. These fiscal realities are going to make it difficult for these programs to operate and they will likely need some subsidy from the University in the 06/07 and 07/08 years.

All of these budget issues will have implications for operations in the Spring semester and will likely carry over to 07/08.

#### Development Office Audit Observations

Foundation External Audit  
CSU Auxiliary Organization Audit

Two observations have been made about the Development Office in both the Foundation external audit and the CSU Auxiliary Organization audit performed by the Chancellor's Office. In both audits they have identified that the Development Office does not have an appropriate software system to identify and track resources. This is not a finding, but an observation. A new system needs to be put in place. PeopleSoft has a contributor relations module that has not been implemented because we couldn't afford it, but this issue is coming to the forefront and will play out in the budget cycle.

#### **X. GREEN MUSIC CENTER UPDATE**

Item deferred.

#### **XI. ITEMS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER**

None.

Schlereth adjourned the meeting at 3:15 pm.  
Minutes prepared by Laura Lupei.