

**CAMPUS REENGINEERING COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 19, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Chair	Jenifer Crist
Erik Dickson	Christopher Dinno
Whitney Diver	Peter Flores
Bennett Hall	Ian Hannah
Sue Hayes	Lori Heffernon
Tyson Hill	Carol Ingerman
Nate Johnson	Kelley Kaslar
Tristan Kelley	Mike Kiraly
Paul Lange	Laura Lupei
Rich Marker	Neil Markley
Brigitte Lahme for Elaine McDonald	Scott Miller
Catherine Nelson	Eduardo Ochoa
Gloria Ogg	Janice Peterson
Katie Pierce	Anna Reynolds
Floyd Ross	Sam Scalise
Kathleen Spitzer	Tim Tiemens
Jason Wenrick	Xiaodong Zhu

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Melinda Barnard	Ruth Burke
Letitia Coate	Dan Condron
Dolly Freidel	Bill Ingels
Susan Kashack	Rick Ludmerer
Perry Marker	Matthew Lopez-Phillips
Peter Neville	Chuck Rhodes
Tim Wandling	Erica Wilcher

GUESTS PRESENT:

Matt Benney	Dee Dee Brannan
Craig Dawson	Whitney McClure

AGENDA

- I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
- II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
- III. CAMPUS STRATEGIC PLANNING**
- IV. CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**
- V. CLASSROOM RENOVATION PROGRAM**
- VI. SUSTAINABILITY – UTILITY INVESTMENTS**
- VII. FACULTY STAFF HOUSING**
- VIII. HOUSING ASSISTANT PROGRAM**
- IX. CAMPUS NOTIFICATION SYSTEM**
- X: CMS RE-TITLE AT SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**
- XI: WASC REFLECTIVE ESSAYS**
- XII: GOOD OF THE ORDER**
- XIII: TOUR OF GREEN MUSIC CENTER**

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

(Please refer to the October 19, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Laurence Furukawa-Schlereth called the meeting to order at 12:20 pm. Schlereth asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the August 31, 2007 meeting. Floyd Ross moved and Sue Hayes seconded. No objections or changes were heard. The minutes were approved unanimously with abstentions from those who were not in attendance at the August meeting.

Schlereth introduced the guests present at the meeting. Matt Benney is the Executive Director for University Preparation Services; Craig Dawson is the Director of Environmental Health and Safety and will be presenting on the food policy; Whitney McClure is the current Executive VP of the Associated Students. Schlereth asked the Academic Senate representatives to provide a new Science and Technology faculty representative since Tom Ormand has left the university.

Schlereth also announced some changes to the agenda. The CMS Re-Title will be discussed earlier in the meeting and the GMC site tour is cancelled due to the inclement weather and will be rescheduled for another day.

II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Audit Activity

There is quite a bit of audit activity, but all are going fairly well. Schlereth reported that all of the auxiliary organization audits are complete and all organizations received unqualified opinions from the external auditor. Minor recommendations were noted in the Academic Foundation for business process improvement; no recommendations were provided for any of the other auxiliaries. The internal control and GAAP audits for the University are being completed. Schlereth doesn't anticipate that there will be any material findings. The CIHS audits are posted online for review, including the

Department of Health and Human Services audit and the KPMG audit. An audit of Grants and Contracts is being conducted by the University Auditor. The fieldwork is complete and the exit report is being drafted. Work has begun on the FISMA audit which reviews financial integrity and internal control procedures.

Faculty Transition Committee

The Faculty Transition Committee is derived from the Faculty Staff Housing committee. New tenure track faculty start at the beginning of the semester, typically in the third week of August, but due to payroll timelines, do not receive their first paycheck until the beginning of October. This may present a hardship to the faculty in their transition to the University. This committee is tasked with brainstorming ways to smooth this transition and make it a simpler process. The CFA President, Andy Merrifield has been invited to join this discussion and anyone else who is interested is more than welcome to join.

Globalization Study Group

The Globalization Study Group is a joint subcommittee of the CRC and the Academic Senate. There will be an open forum next Thursday in the Cooperage from noon to one pm. This is an important forum for the Globalization Study Group to receive feedback from the campus community and Schlereth encouraged anyone who is interested to attend.

Entrepreneurial Services Assessment

The draft report for the Entrepreneurial Services assessment has been received from the consultants. The assessment recommendations will be discussed publically in the data portfolio for WASC and may possibly be presented to CRC at the next meeting.

Information Technology Assessment

Schlereth reported that the Information Technology assessment should start at the beginning of next year and that it is being determined who the external consultant will be.

CIHS Surplus Furniture

CIHS had an off-campus office building located in Rohnert Park. Now that many of the grants have either expired or moved to other agencies, there is no longer a need for this facility. Existing staff will be moved back to campus. Thus, a lot of furniture from this facility is now available for distribution on the campus. The Cabinet has determined that Academic Affairs will have first priority for furniture distribution. Katie Peirce is coordinating the furniture distribution and will be deciding where the most need is amongst the instructional areas.

Review Food Policy

(Please refer to the October 19, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth would like to review and approve the Food Policy for campus use today. Schlereth noted that the Food Policy revisions are of particular interest to the student body and asked Craig Dawson to discuss the details. Dawson said that the key point that he has been working on is allowing student food sales. Approval has been obtained for

non-hazardous food sales on campus with an annual permit fee. This arrangement should provide student groups a lot of flexibility.

Schlereth asked Dawson to specify whether or not students are allowed to sell food, and, if so, what they need to do to comply with the rules. Dawson replied that all food sales need to make use of a pop-up tent to separate the goods from the customers which will be purchased by Associated Students and available for clubs to use. The University will need to purchase an annual permit at \$169 per year. Jacqueline Holly in the Office of Campus Life will act as the single point of contact. Four campus locations have been identified for food sales but the number of food sales allowed is pretty unrestricted. Student Groups and OCL will work with SSE to make sure that there isn't too much conflict with Dining Services.

Erik Dickson noted that the initial reaction to the Food Policy by the student groups should be positive, since food sales are now allowed within certain restrictions instead of not allowed at all. There will be some adjustment while the process gets worked out and then it should run smoothly. Whitney Diver added that the students will be very happy that they can still do food sales on campus.

Scott Miller asked Dawson for clarification on the definition of a potluck. Dawson responded that a potluck is considered to be a controlled group of people at an event not open to the public. Floyd Ross asked how the Food Policy applies to off campus events. Dawson replied that the ideal would be that the event is handled through a licensed catering organization but added that the campus catering exclusivity does not apply to off campus events.

Schlereth asked if the committee would approve the revision to the food policy. No opposition to the Food Policy revision was voiced. Schlereth thanked Dawson for his work on this policy.

Fridays at Four

Fridays at Four will take place in the University Club immediately following the meeting and Schlereth encouraged the members to attend and enjoy the complimentary food and cash bar.

III: CAMPUS STRATEGIC PLANNING

Schlereth asked Eduardo Ochoa to provide an overview of where the campus stands in regards to campus-wide strategic planning. Ochoa explained that after the last WASC campus visit, the President asked Schlereth and Ochoa to co-chair the University Planning Steering Committee to create a strategic plan for the University. A draft of goals and objectives was developed and presented to the campus for feedback. The latest feedback needs to be taken into account and then the next iteration should be released to the campus for public comment. A narrative needs to be added to set the context for the plan itself. The plan will provide a framework for decision making. The goals and objectives are meant to provide a basis for guiding choices between possible options so that initiatives are aligned with the basic University strategy.

IV: CAMPUS FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

(Please refer to the October 19, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Budget priorities are beginning to emerge for the 2008-2009 year and priority setting is tying back to the strategic plan. These priorities are emerging from the administration, from the President and the Cabinet. The UPSC needs to finish up the strategic plan and the campus budget committees will weigh in on these topics. These are fundamental decisions of how to allocate our resources.

Schlereth presented the 2008-2009 budget priorities. The CSU priorities include the Mandatory Costs of employee benefits, new space, utilities and SSI compensations. The second priority is Compensation, both the general increase and closing the salary gap. The third priority is Access which includes enrollment growth, reflected at 2.5% for the CSU system along with related financial aid costs, which increase along with enrollment. The CSU is attempting to get the enrollment growth increased because nearly every campus is over enrolled. The final priority is Long Term Needs which is largely Information Technology and Student Services. This priority list is the backdrop of our campus budget process.

The campus is developing 2008-2009 budget priorities. These have not been adopted but are open for campus discussion. Some of the priorities are mandatory and some tie back to strategic planning. The Mandatory Costs and Compensation items track with the CSU priorities. Our enrollment growth planning is higher than the system as a whole, which is consistent with the Trustee's plan for our campus. We have additional priorities in the area of Access relating to our strategic plan, especially in the areas of Academic Quality and Faculty/Staff Development. The campus priorities are to fund instruction at an SFR of 18.98 and high at a 75/25 Tenure Track/Lecturer mix and to provide the CSU base starting salary for incoming faculty. These are campus priorities that tie directly back to our strategic plan. Faculty Development is again a campus priority which ties directly to the Faculty/Staff Development goal area in our strategic plan. The Long Term Needs priorities are not in the CSU plan but are campus priorities. The faculty workstation program has been funded on an ad hoc basis but this would create permanent budget for replacing machines every four years. This ties back to Academic Quality and Faculty/Staff Development. The IT CSU Initiatives and Libraries CSU Initiatives would be defined by the system steering committees. The campus expects to receive some money for maintenance needs. Classroom renovations are emerging as an issue, so this priority ties back to Academic Quality and the Quality of the Student Experience. Sustainability initiatives refer to infrastructure sustainability and ties back to strategic planning goals in Sustainability. Additionally, a campus priority is to Repair the Base. All of our divisions are operating with a base budget that isn't appropriate due to the 03/04 and 04/05 budget cuts. We need to understand the exiting issues and devise tactics to repair these problems.

The Auxiliary organizations also have a list of budget priorities for 08/09. All the organizations must deal with mandatory costs for benefits, utilities and compensation. There are three major projects going on in our auxiliaries – Tuscany, the University

Center and the Green Music Center. The Tuscany and University Center projects are connected to the Quality of Student Experience goal area and GMC is tied to Community Engagement.

The Capital Outlay budget priorities also relate to our strategic plan. Many of the projects – Tuscany, the University Center, the waste water holding tank and the domestic water tank – all are infrastructure projects that allow the campus to accommodate enrollment growth. The Infrastructure goal area also includes such items as capital renewal projects, classroom renovations and minor capital outlay (such as meeting ADA requirements, which also falls under the Diversity goal area). Lastly, the sustainability initiative is directly related to the Sustainability goal area in the strategic plan.

Diver asked if we get funded for the 5% or the 2.5% enrollment growth. Schlereth responded that this campus gets funded at 5% growth, the system as a whole is funded at 2.5%. Catherine Nelson asked how this enrollment funding affects the 300 FTE that we currently over enrolled. Ochoa responded that the intent is to use that enrollment towards our “growth” requirements for next year. Schlereth added that if we don’t follow that strategy, we will have too many students and too many costs.

Schlereth noted that since the campus is overenrolled, we have received more revenue than expected and need to analyze the best way to appropriate those funds. Although we do not receive additional marginal cost formula for the overenrolled number of students we do receive additional student fees. This money will be allocated entirely to instruction rather than divvying it out amongst all of the divisions. This is to directly address the increased workload in instruction due to the increased number of students. Ochoa added that it would be helpful to receive these funds in time to affect planning for the Spring semester.

V: CLASSROOM RENOVATION PROGRAM

(Please refer to the October 19, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Dinno provided a presentation on the classroom renovation program. The presentation included an overview of the program as well as detail on the classrooms that were renovated in Summer 2007. Dinno also presented the five-year classroom renovation plan which outlines the renovation of about nine classrooms per year.

VI: SUSTAINABILITY – UTILITY INVESTMENTS

(Please refer to the October 19, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth asked the committee to consider the Utility Investments as an action item as it is a second reading of the proposal. The CSU goal is to reduce energy consumption by 15% by the end of 2009-2010. This proposed plan would allow our campus to comply with CSU Executive Order 987. The proposal has been updated since the last meeting so that the financing includes borrowing for the first year of debt service. The total to be borrowed is just under \$2M. Schlereth noted that, in theory, the savings in the utility bill would allow us to cover the payments and eliminate the debt in about seven years.

Discussion ensued regarding the Utility Investment. Catharine Nelson asked if the campus would be able to afford this item in light of possible budget cuts and the CIHS gap and other pending concerns. Schlereth replied that we can, if the engineers' projections are correct, and then there will be zero cost to the campus. The major concern is the increase of utility costs. The CSU has tried to recognize these increases in their budget priorities, but if the Governor doesn't fund rising energy costs, the campuses will have to cover them. That may happen even if we don't proceed with this project and then we will have to pay for the rising costs instead of the debt payments. Schlereth also added that from the sustainability perspective, this project is the right thing to do. Ochoa added that we may even be underestimating the dollar savings. Diver asked if other campuses are implementing similar plans and Schlereth replied that other campuses are doing bundled packages with PG&E, but our campus is at the forefront. Sue Hayes noted that one of the costs of not proceeding with this project right now is losing the incentives and construction costs will rise. Gloria Ogg asked if the campus uses less energy, will the CSU cut our utility budget. Schlereth replied that utility charges are the responsibility of the campus, so they would not cut our allocation. Brigitte Lahme asked how accurate the utility savings projections are and Dinno responded that those were prepared by experts at PG&E. Erik Dickson asked how quickly we will have realized savings and Schlereth responded that we will take out a loan for the full amount and receive 60% of the incentives up front. Ian Hannah pointed out that this is a CSU requirement, so even if we do not proceed with this plan, we will need to do something else. Schlereth noted that this project needs to be presented to the Trustees in November in order to take advantage of the PG&E incentives. Scott Miller added that this project is right in line with the values in our strategic plan. Mike Kiraly noted that the campus has a responsibility to push sustainability and this is another chance to remain on the cutting edge. Sam Scalise voiced some concerns about costs and upgrades for the Veridium software. Schlereth added that this is a system-wide debate between the CIOs and the engineers, and this will need to be worked out. However, some sort of utility savings will occur in this area, regardless of the specific software being used.

Neil Markley made a motion to present the plan to the Trustees and request to adjust the capital outlay program to fund these items; Nate Johnson seconded. The committee unanimously approved the motion with no abstentions.

Miller suggested that Schlereth present this information to the faculty and Schlereth responded that he would like to present the classroom renovation and sustainability projects at the next Academic Senate.

VII: FACULTY STAFF HOUSING

Sue Hayes provided a report on the current status of the Faculty Staff Housing committee. The committee is undertaking a new survey to ensure that they are in touch with the needs of the incoming faculty.

Schlereth asked the committee to provide feedback on a discussion of the utilization of the faculty/staff housing land. Currently, SSE owns, on behalf of the University, 90 acres

approximately one-mile from campus. This land is intended to be used for the Faculty/Staff Housing project which would provide low cost housing for faculty and staff and an additional 400 studio living units. SSE bought the property because they could move more quickly and to prevent mark up of the property. The plan was to have SSE buy and hold the land and then sell it to Housing and Parking. This hasn't happened yet, because if we do want to sell the land or part of it, this is easier accomplished through SSE. There is currently some discussion on campus that since the project is in limbo, we should sell the land. Housing and Parking currently pay the annual debt service on the land, so it is not costing SSE to hold the land, providing a disincentive to sell. Schlereth added that the land gives the campus more flexibility for other kinds of growth as well. It seems to be a good investment for the Housing and Parking programs. Schlereth asked for feedback from Housing and Parking and the committee, should we hold on to this land or should SSE sell it?

Ogg asked what the reasoning was behind possibly selling the land. She asked if we would be able to make money or even break even if the land was sold now. Ochoa added that this is not a source of relief for other budget problems, since the cost liability resides in the Housing and Parking programs. Tim Tiemens said that, even with the Tuscany project, we can't house all students for their first two years. Housing's interest is to provide additional residences. Johnson agreed and added that Parking wants to hold on to the land. The campus doesn't have much room to grow, so it would be a shame to give up what we have so soon, especially in the current real estate climate.

VIII: HOUSING ASSISTANT PROGRAM

(Please refer to the October 19, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

The purpose behind the Housing Assistant Program is to make attending SSU more affordable by providing low or no cost housing for services provided. It is a class co-op arrangement. There are many ways to arrange services. Where the problems lie are in designating employment status. Kathleen Spitzer provided an overview of the complexity of providing employment classifications.

Housing is ultimately a self-support operation, but this program could possibly raise costs for all other students to cover. If we go the route of providing hourly wages, the question would be if Housing or the department receiving the labor would be financially responsible. The Housing Assistant Program group will continue to meet and explore these options.

IX: CAMPUS NOTIFICATION SYSTEM

Johnson provided a quick update on the Campus Notification System. Activity is occurring at the system level and CSULA is testing a pilot program. Unfortunately, there are issues with the vendor's experience in an academic environment so the tests from the pilot program have failed. The system-wide committee continues to look into this.

X: CMS RE-TITLE

Schlereth announced that the CMS title change to e-Wolf is not going to happen. More consultation needs to occur prior to a name change. This item is not the highest priority, but it will come back on the agenda at some point.

Schlereth mentioned that a more current issue is that Peoplesoft is ready to link Barnes and Noble to student registration in order to simplify textbook ordering for students. This is a potentially controversial action. Schlereth emphasized that this is not a Barnes and Noble decision, it is a campus decision and he asked the committee to reflect on this issue.

Nelson suggested referring to the Globalization Task Force because it is an issue of empowering Barnes and Noble. Hayes argued that this feature would be greatly appreciated by students and parents. Schlereth noted that if the bookstore wasn't outsourced, this would most likely be a non-issue. Markley added that this is a costly feature and Barnes and Noble has provided all of the funding. Additionally, this feature will enable early book orders, making it easier for Barnes and Noble to get additional used books. Miller said that he would discuss this with Tim Wandling and the faculty will want to discuss it. This issue has implications for other faculty concerns, such as timing of book request submissions. Jason Wenrick added that the Accessible Technology Initiative requires that book orders get in early. Hannah noted that the link provided may be to Barnes and Noble, but that students and parents can use the information provided on required books to shop elsewhere if they choose. Diver believes that accessibility is the important issue here and that the point of having a bookstore on campus is to make it easier for students to get books. Student shouldn't have to go off campus to buy books. Hayes pointed out that there should be enough lead time so there will be no real disruption for faculty. Bennett Hall added that, from a student perspective, having the books ready ahead of time is really convenient and would assist in making sure there are enough books for the class. Miller added that if this becomes a controversial issue, a supporting statement from student governance would be very helpful. Dickson agreed and stated that this should be taken to the ASI Senate. Markley said that there are two basic issues here – first, do we want to give this additional accessibility to the students and second, how does the ATI play into it.

Schlereth said that, because CMS has been tasked with this project, the decision falls in the purview of the CRC. This is not an SSE or Barnes and Noble decision. Wenrick will work with the student leadership and the faculty will discuss the issue. The committee will revisit this topic at the next meeting. Schlereth would like to bring this to a close by the end of the semester.

XI: WASC REFLECTIVE ESSAYS

(Please refer to the October 19, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

WASC will be visiting the campus in the spring and we need to provide a capacity review report that includes the reflective essays. These have been compiled by three faculty associates and the essays are now open for comment by the campus community. Any feedback should go to Elaine Sundberg or Rose Bruce.

XII: GOOD OF THE ORDER

Schlereth acknowledged the work of those involved on the classroom renovation project. This is a major step forward for to reinstitute this program and make a long-term commitment to provide funding. This is a major step in re-uniting facilities planning with academic concerns. Schlereth also commended the committee for their vote on the sustainability issue.

Johnson thanked those who worked on the Management Development Academy for putting together a strong program. He also noted that the Pathway Lighting project is complete and thanked Facilities for their work on that project.

Schlereth adjourned the meeting at 3:47 p.m.