

**CAMPUS REENGINEERING COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 7, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Chair
Ruth Burke
Jenifer Crist
Christopher Dinno
Timothy Dondero
Dolly Freidel
Ian Hannah
Lori Heffernon
Bill Ingels
Kelley Kaslar
Mike Kiraly
Matthew Lopez-Phillips
Laura Lupei
Neil Markley
Catherine Nelson
Gloria Ogg
Anna Reynolds
Floyd Ross
Kathleen Spitzer
Tim Wandling

Melinda Barnard
Letitia Coate
Erik Dickson
Whitney Diver
Peter Flores
Bennett Hall
Sue Hayes
Tyson Hill
Carol Ingerman
Tristan Kelley
Paul Lange
Rick Ludmerer
Rich Marker
Brigitte Lahme for Elaine McDonald
Eduardo Ochoa
Janice Peterson
Chuck Rhodes
Beez Schell
Tim Tiemens

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dan Condron
Susan Kashack
Scott Miller
Katie Pierce
Jason Wenrick
Xiaodong Zhu

Nate Johnson
Perry Marker
Peter Neville
Sam Scalise
Erica Wilcher

GUESTS PRESENT:

Pam Su

AGENDA

- I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
- II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT
- III. FOCUS THE NATION
- IV. CAMPUS STRATEGIC PLANNING
- V. COMMON MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS
- VI. FACULTY STAFF HOUSING
- VII. HOUSING ASSISTANT PROGRAM
- VIII. CAMPUS NOTIFICATION SYSTEM
- IX. FACULTY IN RESIDENCE PROGRAM
- X: ADVICE REGARDING QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE
- XI: TOUR OF GREEN MUSIC CENTER

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

October 19, 2007

(Please refer to the December 7, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Laurence Furukawa-Schlereth called the meeting to order at 12:15 pm. Schlereth made some changes to the agenda, moving item number ten, the topic of Advice Regarding Questions Raised by the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to earlier in the meeting and added the topic of campus consultation to the end of the agenda. Schlereth then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 19, 2007 meeting. Floyd Ross moved and Carol Ingerman 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 also introduced Beez Schell and Pam Su to the committee. Schell is the new faculty representative from the School of Science and Technology joining us from the Kinesiology department. Su is visiting as a guest in Peter Neville's absence.

II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(Please refer to the December 7, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Globalization Study Group

This group, also known as the outsourcing study group, is a partnership between CRC and the Academic Senate tasked with analyzing the question of outsourcing on campus. It is co-chaired by Schlereth and Art Warmoth and has been meeting throughout the fall semester. The group had hoped to complete a report by the end of the fall semester, but it is likely that a draft report will be done at the beginning of the spring semester. The draft report will be put out to the campus for comment prior to making a final report. There has already been one open forum and the group would like to hold another open forum in the Spring after the release of the draft report. The intent is to create a set of filters that any outsourcing decision should go through. The first filter is that the decision should not have a negative impact on the employment of any permanent employee of the University. Secondly, the business partner that we choose to engage with must adhere to campus blue paper policies, particularly the discrimination and diversity policies. Third, there would need to be a fundamental reason to consider outsourcing at all. Fourth, if the campus were to engage in an outsourcing dialogue, all appropriate

CSU procurement and contracting guidelines would be followed. Overarching the entire process would be extensive communication and consultation. The process would be conducted as much as possible in the open. Schlereth pointed out that the campus already partners with many external vendors for various services. Schlereth asked that representatives on the committee take this information back to their various constituent bodies for discussion and feedback.

Tim Wandling asked if this topic could be discussed at the next Academic Senate meeting. Schlereth agreed that this was a good suggestion and that he, Warmoth and Whitney Diver could provide a report to that committee.

Sustainability – Utility Investment Project

This project is currently underway in preparation for the various utility investments and improvements.

Staff Development E-Learning

The University has made faculty development a strategic priority and has set aside funding for this purpose. The Management Development Academy has been implemented for members of the management classification. However, the campus has not yet developed a professional development program for staff. The CSU has come forward with a project called e-Learning. For the modest price of \$120 per person, the participant gains access to over 300 electronic learning courses. Schlereth discussed the program with the A&F management team and made a decision to purchase the subscription for every non-faculty employee on campus. Kathleen Spitzer is coordinating the effort and is signing up all of the non-faculty employees. So far, SSU is the only campus to purchase a blanket subscription for all staff. Spitzer will perform an assessment at the end of the year to determine if we should continue the program. There are about six hundred and fifty staff employees who will be able to take advantage of the courses offered through this program as many and as often as they would like. In addition, Schlereth hopes to find other ways to encourage development of non-faculty employees. This program is being funded from A&F salary savings for all staff campus-wide.

Green Music Center Presenting

Schlereth explained that at the beginning of the semester, a group of people considered to be closely connected to the student experience were brought together to discuss ways in which the Green Music Center can be used to enhance the student experience. Previously there didn't seem to be a strong connection felt on the campus between Green and the student experience, but this open campus conversation has been very gratifying because the participants are from all areas of campus and have been willing to leave organizational issues at the door and just discuss how this facility can be viewed from the student perspective. What is emerging is an exciting set of initiatives that would take place in the GMC and its hospitality center that would really enhance the student experience. Schlereth feels that this has been a very rewarding conversation and that for the first time in ten years, there seems to be a degree of excitement and positive energy around the project.

University Center Task Force

Schlereth noted that the University Center is more than just a new building; it is also an opportunity to bring together a number of curricular and co-curricular goals.

WASC Update

Schlereth emphasized that the WASC review is a very important project for our campus. The capacity review is coming up in the Spring semester.

CSU Travel Best Practice

Schlereth announced that the travel practices of most CSU campuses are outdated and the CSU is making an effort to modernize and streamline across the campuses. This is the first of hopefully many best practice initiatives at the CSU level.

Grants and Contracts Audit

Schlereth noted that there has been a lot of campus conversation regarding the audits of Grants and Contracts. The latest of the audits was requested by the Board of Trustees and began in late summer has now been received and is available on the CSU Internal Auditor's webpage. This audit was performed by the independent trustees audit staff who answer directly to the trustees and covers all of Grants and Contracts, not just CIHS. The scope of this audit is similar to what is being proposed by the Academic Senate resolution. This particular set of findings is actually quite remarkable for the campus. The audit provided only three recommendations for improvements in our business processes. The campus has only had one better audit and that was of Disability Services. The audit found that the campus follows all circulars and CSU procedures. Schlereth thanked Lori Heffernon, Associate Controller over Grants and Contracts, for her leadership for all those who do post-award grant administration as well as the Administrative Managers in the schools who oversee the administration in their areas.

A-133 audit

The A-133 audit is an external audit of Grants and Contracts. It is also similar in scope to what the Academic Senate resolution is calling for but only deals with federal awards.

FISMA Audit

The campus undergoes the FISMA audit every two years which tests for financial integrity. This is carried out by a different auditor on the Trustees' audit team.

Schlereth added that the names of the auditors will be made public, if allowed, so that people may provide information and feedback to the auditors. Schlereth explained that this is not usually done, but that under these circumstances, he feels it is important that the campus community feels that the auditors are accessible to them.

Fridays at Four

Fridays at Four will be hosted in the University Club directly after the meeting. Schlereth invited all the committee members to attend and enjoy the complimentary hors d'Oeuvres and no-host bar.

III: FOCUS THE NATION

Schlereth introduced Timothy Dondero to discuss an exciting new initiative. Dondero explained that Focus the Nation is an unprecedented education initiative on global warming solutions with over two thousand campuses signed on to participate. The focus is on active education of university students regarding environmental impact. Through education alone, the initiative hopes to reduce up to 30% of usage. Dondero thanked Wandling, Su and Dolly Freidel as well as Facilities and CPDC for their assistance.

The hub for the project is in the Rec Center and there are plans to invite external groups and community members as well as encouraging faculty to participate. Freidel's class is assisting in the work on this initiative. Other possible programs include inviting speakers to campus to discuss sustainability issues and to gather additional support to educate students on what is already being done and what can be done better. Dondero is also working with University Affairs to provide the link to Focus the Nation on the SSU homepage and really make SSU a place where people can find a home for sustainability. The National Focus the Nation website has a lot of information on the sustainability and the program itself. Dondero encouraged anyone who is interested in participating or to email focusthenation@yahoo.com.

Wandling thanked Dondero for bringing this to the campus and for increasing awareness of sustainability. Schlereth also thanked Dondero and the Associated Students for being such a tremendous collaborative partner on the infrastructure side. Freidel added that the intent is to encourage faculty to insert concerns regarding sustainability into their curriculum and to encourage their students to attend sessions and lectures regarding sustainability. This is a unique interdisciplinary opportunity to collaborate with students and the seeds we plant here are going to carry our students into the future. This is a vital project.

IV: CAMPUS STRATEGIC PLANNING

(Please refer to the December 7, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Status of Campus Plan

The University Strategic Planning Committee has been working on a campus strategic plan for at least two years now. The plan provided in the packet is a draft version of what will be released to the campus for comment. This plan includes explanatory narratives with nine strategic goal areas and corresponding objectives. The initiatives will be created at the Division level. The divisions and consultative bodies should take direction from the campus strategic plan in the areas that are relevant.

Progress with Division Plan

The A&F Division strategic plan is flying somewhat blind without a finalized campus plan, but activities must proceed. Schlereth reviewed the status of initiatives in the Division strategic plan for 07/08 and noted that good progress has been made this year. Development of next year's plan will begin soon. There will be big issues in 08/09 such as funding the University Center and operating the Green Music Center. Schlereth also believes that there will be a strong focus on the student experience in 08/09.

Catherine Nelson asked if the University strategic plan would be coming to this committee for endorsement. Schlereth responded that it certainly could. Nelson added that it should perhaps be endorsed by other governing and consultative bodies such as the Academic Senate and Associated Students Board. Wandling agreed that an endorsement statement would be appropriate but clarified that no other body should be changing the language or content of the plan. Diver agreed with Wandling that the plan must be endorsed as a whole document. Nelson asked how the initiatives will be handled. Schlereth replied that initiatives will be handled by the entities that have organizational responsibility for the goal areas and objectives. Schlereth added that it is important to repair the base before we can begin moving forward with new initiatives. The most crucial financial issues must be identified and addressed. It is his hope to bring these issues forward and attempt to obtain some consensus on whether or not

they are real issues and what are the priorities in addressing them. From there, it is the President's decision on how to proceed. There was a general campus consensus that faculty development and workstations were areas that needed to be addressed. It is difficult to get fired up about new initiatives when there are fundamental issues that should be addressed first.

Wandling expressed appreciation for Schlereth's focus on the consultative process and willingness to address the real concerns of everyone involved. These are good steps and Wandling feels that Schlereth has been very responsive. Melinda Barnard recommended attending the school department chair meetings in order to gain a different perspective. Schlereth pointed out that neither the campus and or system have been able to recover from the cuts in 03/04 and 04/05 but we are being expected to move forward with the CSU's Access to Excellence plan and our own campus strategic plan. Schlereth noted that this situation is someone unusual and will probably require some innovative approaches.

Schlereth also noted that California has an overall operating budget of about \$100 billion and it looks to be about \$10 billion in deficit for 08/09. There are real concerns that the compact may not be honored. It is initially believed that enrollment growth and compensation will be funded but that mandatory costs and long term needs may not. More information will be available after the Governor's message in January. It is critical that we meet our enrollment target without being enrolled to keep faculty workload and SFR under control. The CSU system is already overenrolled by ten percent. A balance needs to be struck between the economic requirements and the political aspect of access. Nelson added that limiting access has a disproportionate effect on the most vulnerable populations.

V: COMMON MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Schlereth announced that this is an action item to decide whether or not to activate the textbook link in PeopleSoft. The ability now exists in the PeopleSoft administration module to provide a link to the Barnes and Noble bookstore for students once they complete registration. Students can then either buy their books directly from Barnes and Noble or print their book list and purchase their books somewhere else. Schlereth noted that, given the potential controversial nature of this topic, he asked the committee members to discuss this issue with their constituent groups.

Peter Flores noted that the verbage of the link was a point of contention during the last discussion and that the link will read "click here to view books required for your courses". The link will then take the student to a Barnes and Noble webpage that will list all books submitted by the faculty that are required for the course.

Schlereth added that another concern was the connection with the Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI). The University itself at this time does not actually collect book orders. Book orders are developed by the professor and they choose where they will place the order. Some faculty choose to use Barnes and Noble and some do not. The only way to know the books for the link is if the professor orders the book from Barnes and Noble. If they do not, there will be no books listed on the webpage. A decision needs to be made on this issue. It has already missed the first registration cycle in order to wait for discussion at this meeting but Schlereth would like to move forward for the second registration cycle.

Sue Hayes noted that she polled the faculty in her department on this issue. Most of the input she received was concern about the language on the webpage for those classes in which faculty chose not to deal with Barnes and Noble. Otherwise, everyone seemed to be supportive since it still allows the students to choose where to buy their books. Markley added that the page will say that the book has not been ordered. Flores clarified that it would read something like “there is currently no book information for this class, please try again later.” However, this is not clear whether or not the book has been ordered late with Barnes and Noble or not at all. Almost 10% of book orders come in at the last minute. Wandling added that this has not been discussed at the Academic Senate but that his sense is that it is a controversial issue. Though he personally endorses the textbook link, the Barnes and Noble presence on campus is a sensitive subject. Dondero added that it is the faculty’s responsibility to provide accurate volume and text information in a timely manner to Barnes and Noble so that students have the ability to make choices about where to purchase their textbooks. Chuck Rhodes noted that he supports the idea and added that many of our incoming students pre-order their books from the bookstore and this would be a good service to provide to them. It allows our students to get discounted books from Barnes and Noble or another vendor of their choice.

Diver said that the ASI Senate unanimously endorses the textbook link and thinks that it is extremely valuable for students. This will enhance the quality of the student experience and students are excited about this possibility. It may be controversial, but the ASI Senate stands behind it. Erik Dickson added that our current system costs students more money especially since textbooks are an increasing proportion of the costs of higher education. Ian Hannah added that a lot of time and effort has been put into this project and it would be a shame to abandon it.

Discussion ensued regarding the content of the webpage with some faculty supporting verbage directing students to departmental websites. However, the student’s opposed this idea, noting that it would require more effort for the student to track down their book information. Schlereth also added that we may have limited influence in customizing Barnes and Noble webpages for each department. Wandling also asked about the effects of ATI and Schlereth responded that this is a different issue and is an academic question.

Schlereth thanked the committee for their feedback. He feels persuaded that the link should be turned out, though there may still be some controversy. This decision should be announced at the Academic Senate. However, his concern is primarily about the Associated Students and they have endorsed the link. Schlereth asked Flores to ensure that the link is active for second registration.

VI: FACULTY STAFF HOUSING

Land Recommendation

Schlereth asked Hayes to provide an update on the Faculty Staff Housing project. Hayes explained that the question was raised whether or not to sell the land since the project is stalled. This question was taken to the Faculty Staff Housing committee and it was not considered to be a good idea. Additionally, the committee is working on creating a survey to get updated information from possible participants.

Faculty Transition Committee

Schlereth provided an update on the Faculty Transition Committee. The committee has concluded that it would be best to provide two to three thousand dollars as a transitional allowance in the relocation package. It is necessary to work with the Chancellor's Office to ascertain whether or not we are allowed to provide this allowance and then determine how to fund the program. However, this is an important project because it is a key need for new faculty hires. It seems to be a small amount of money that would make a huge difference.

VII: HOUSING ASSISTANT PROGRAM

(Please refer to the December 7, 2007 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth reported that the Housing Assistant Program is moving along in the planning stages. The intent is to make attending SSU a little more affordable by covering housing costs for students participating in the program. The program would start out small so that improvements could be made over time. Tim Tiemens provided an outline of the program proposal listing three possible assistant positions – facilities assistance, housekeeping assistance and programming and service desk assistance. He noted that the issue of supervision might be a little problematic but that he and Spitzer are working on determining the best way to meet CSU and SSU student assistant criteria. The target population of the program would be returning students rather than incoming freshman. This program will also assist in providing housing space for upperclassman on campus that would otherwise be only available for meeting the demand of incoming freshman. Tiemens estimates that the program would cost about \$40,000 in the first year. Schlereth asked the committee to consider the program over the break and come back with feedback in February.

VIII: CAMPUS NOTIFICATION SYSTEM

Schlereth asked Tyson Hill to provide an update on the campus notification system and the SSU emergency plan. Hill provided the committee an update regarding the work that is being done by the Emergency Notification Committee. The committee is looking into potential emergency notification vendors and is currently going through the University's RFP process to generate bids. Hill hopes to have an update for the February meeting.

IX: FACULTY IN RESIDENCE PROGRAM

Schlereth asked Chuck Rhodes to provide an overview of the status of the Faculty in Residence Program. Rhodes reported that the process has begun and that he has met with various faculty and is working with the Freshman Year Experience (FYE) coordinator. He is in the process of writing the job description. This program should enhance the retention of students involved and provides a better atmosphere for freshman living in Sauvignon Village. Rhodes hopes to begin the program in 08/09. Wandling asked how this program would move forward if there was no FYE program in 08/09. Rhodes replied that the Faculty in Residence Program may also work with the Freshman Interest Group program as well as other options. Schlereth thanked Rhodes and the others that have been involved in this project.

X. ADVICE REGARDING QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE

Schlereth explained that the Academic Senate has created an ad hoc committee to discuss issues surrounding the vote of no confidence for the President. The first issue that came forward was CIHS and many issues have been raised in that dialogue,

including the post-award grants administration process, the rationale behind the allocation of IDC and the audit reports. Schlereth clarified that he is unable to comment on the details of the federal government findings or independent auditor findings and that issues with these findings should be raised directly with those offices. He is also unable to comment on the criminal investigation.

Schlereth asked the committee to provide advice on how he should proceed in responding to the questions raised by the ad hoc committee. He could possibly discuss what is involved in post-award grant administration, including what activities employees are involved in and the regulations the University is required to follow. The findings in the audits can be tied back to these activities and regulations. Additionally, the cost allocation process should perhaps be reviewed by this body since the rationale behind the EO753 reimbursements of self-support operations to the general fund has been questioned.

Melinda Barnard noted that there needs to be a distinction made between what is an appropriate request and what is not. Requests for data and explanations regarding procedure are appropriate. What is not appropriate is, generally, a detailed account of what occurred, in the style of a trial or investigation. This approach is inaccurate and seems more like a witch hunt. She feels that Schlereth should not have to defend and recount actions except for what is public data, such as minutes, that he is obligated to provide as the CFO. Hayes said that she is disappointed in the make-up of the ad hoc committee and believes that there should be some subject matter experts and grantees that could provide good input involved. Markley added that his areas are also responsible for paying the EO753 fees, but that there is an understanding that costs are involved in running these organizations and that there is a clear methodology behind the charges. The core issue is a lack of trust - trust in the administration, the Trustees, the auditors. His concern is that, even if the information is presented, it will not be believed. Wandling clarified that the Academic Senate Executive Committee voted on the representation in the ad hoc committee and he believes that it is a positive thing that these questions are being asked. He feels like progress is being made and that Schlereth's presentation to the Senate was very helpful. Erik Dickson said that what he is hearing from students is that the questions seem to change every day and that there seems to be a "moving target". The ASI has a good relationship with A&F and part of that is from asking all of the questions and going through them one by one. They may not always like the answer, but they understand the reality behind it.

Catherine Nelson explained that, at the most fundamental level, the questions being asked revolve around the issues of consultation and the distribution of resources. Using the IDC issue as an example, there are feelings that there wasn't much consultation in the decision to set the percentage of IDC that a grant must bring in with it. Also, there are feelings that there is a fundamental problem with the distribution of resources on this campus and that Academic Affairs has taken too much of the cuts when they are tasked with providing the direct mission and that there are questions about the amount of IDC that goes to A&F to fund responsibilities in the division and that it can be viewed as empire building. Nelson clarified that in providing this explanation, she is not intending to provide judgments or expect anyone to agree or disagree. However, along with the diversity question, which is not relevant to this discussion, these are the major issues as she understands them. Schlereth replied that he understands the fundamental questions being raised, though he's still not sure how CIHS fits into all of that. He added that there has been a lot of misinformation about IDC distribution.

Gloria Ogg explained that, from the perspective of A&F and the people who do the post-award work, she would just as soon prefer to have a smaller empire. Over half of the travel claims that her department deals with are grant related. Additionally, general fund travel claims are typically pretty straight forward, however, the grants, auxiliary and self-support related ones tend to be more complicated. It would be much easier to only have to deal with the general fund. She believes that there are costs involved in running these programs and you can either afford to pay for them, or you can't. If the cost is so high as to be prohibitive, we shouldn't be bringing them in. Schlereth added that perhaps the University should get out of the grants business entirely. Many universities separate their grants out into a separate, self-supporting entity.

Letitia Coate said that she is putting together a six year analysis of the IDC distribution including how much came in, where it was distributed and how the money was spent. She added that the future is where we need to focus. We need to build a grants and contracts program that fits SSU in size and programming. The focus should be on the faculty in classrooms. We now have an opportunity to build a program that we can manage and that will protect the liability of the University and support the faculty. Markley thanked Nelson for bringing up these issues. Though we have discussed Grants and Contracts in this forum before, these issues have not been raised in the same way. He believes we need to have this dialogue if we are going to move forward. There needs to be a continual dialogue rather than having these kinds of blow ups. We need to put aside the chronicles and focus on the issues brought up today.

Wandling explained that the CIHS issue came up at this time because of Bob Karlsrud's involvement. Barnard said that there has been too much of a focus on a historical perspective and that the framing of this issue should be towards the future. Nelson replied that the focus on the historical perspective is because of the feeling of a need for accountability. The call for an independent auditor is a result of a lack of trust. At some point, we not only have to move forward, but to step out of our institutional mindsets. People will not be able to do this until they feel that the needs for accountability and trust have been met.

Schlereth said that to address the trust issue, he will put the information out on the IDC to indicate how it was distributed and what the money was used for. He's not sure how to address the concerns over deceit and misinformation. Coate added that we are backing up our numbers for this analysis, just as if we were going through an audit. However, if there is still the belief that we aren't telling the truth, there is not much else we can do.

Schlereth addressed the ad hoc committee's calls for an external audit. He believes that it is not likely that the Trustees will hire another auditor because that would indicate a lack of faith in their own auditors. It is a possibility to ask the University Auditor to speak at CRC or the Academic Senate. There have been ten audits of Grants and Contracts in the last several months; seven of them by an external body, one of those audits were done by the federal government. Nelson asked if we could ask the state auditor to come talk to us. Schlereth responded that the state auditor does not answer to us. The audit function of the CSU has been delegated to the CSU Trustees and their auditor. If the state auditor has to do an audit, this indicates that the Trustee auditor is sneaky or lying or didn't do her job correctly, which puts the state auditor in a tricky position. Schlereth added that it is troublesome that our campus has lost confidence in the Trustee's

auditors. Nelson replied that this is because of the Trustees' comments regarding the vote of no confidence.

Schlereth said that another possible response could be to create a joint group from CRC and FSSP and people directly involved with grants to analyze the results of the ten audit reports and develop future models and business processes. Schlereth asked the committee to consider these possible responses and provide feedback.

XI: TOUR OF GREEN MUSIC CENTER

Item deferred.

Schlereth adjourned the meeting at 3:57 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Laura Lupei.