

CAMPUS REENGINEERING COMMITTEE

March 27, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Chair
Courtney Buljan
Ruth Burke
Dan Condron
Erik Dickson
Joe Diver
Peter Flores
Ben Ford
Bill Fusco
Ian Hannah
Sue Hayes
Lori Heffernon
Bill Ingels
Carol Ingerman for Christopher Dinno
Mike Kiraly
Paul Lange
Rick Ludmerer
Perry Marker
Nicolette Margi

Neil Markley
Elizabeth Martinez for Melinda Barnard
Scott Miller
Susan Moulton
Peter Neville
Eduardo Ochoa
Gloria Ogg
Mack Olson for Matthew Lopez-Phillips
Janice Peterson
Derek Pierre
Chuck Rhodes
Robert Rosen
Floyd Ross
Sam Scalise
Kathleen Spitzer
Tim Tiemens
Tim Wandling
Jason Wenrick
Xiaodong Zhu

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jenifer Crist
Letitia Coate
Dolly Freidel
Nate Johnson

Kelley Kaslar
Susan Kashack
Robert McNamara

GUESTS PRESENT:

Barbara Danelia (staff to committee)

Heather Hanson

AGENDA

- I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
- II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
- III. FINANCE**
- IV. MANGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM**
- V. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT**
- VI. IT ADVISORY BOARD**
- VII. PROGRESS WITH ASSESSMENT RECOMMENDATIONS**
- VIII. CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY SUB-COMMITTEE**
- IX. CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY SUB-COMMITTEE – DEANS/PROVOST INPUT**
- X. DIVISION DIVERSITY INITIATIVES**
- XI. DIVISION STRATEGIC PLANNING**

I: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

February 6, 2009

Larry Furukawa-Schlereth called the meeting to order at 12:15 pm. Ian Hannah commented that a couple of minor grammatical changes were made to the minutes based on committee member suggestions. The minutes from the February 6, 2009 meeting were approved unanimously as amended.

II. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Baseball Batting Cage Facility

Schlereth stated that the Baseball Batting Cage Facility project is still moving forward but no additional updates are available at this time.

Common Financial System

Schlereth indicated that the CSU continues to move forward with development of a Common Financial System (CFS) for all 23 CSU campuses. This new initiative is designed to add functionality and reduce costs. Some discussion has taken place with the CFS development group regarding consolidating HR practices but this has temporarily been placed on hiatus. This is due to the current budget tightening and the related anticipated need for greater HR resources and attention. SSU's current system does not vary widely from the CFS and thus the campus is not anticipating many structural changes but some account codes would be changed as a result.

Animal Policy

Schlereth stated that the revised Animals on Campus Policy was approved by Cabinet and will soon be released to the campus for implementation.

University Center Update

Schlereth indicated that the University Center project is on hold until the enrollment growth uncertainties are clarified. The design process is still being completed in the interim period. Schlereth added that it may be beneficial to construct during this down economy due to lower prices but revenue streams will need to be fully analyzed first. The current UC design also holds a certain number of square feet related to campus diversity efforts. The Center for Student Leadership, Involvement and Service (CSLIS) office has a designated place in the UC but it is supported by the General Fund and thus a solution needs to be worked out so this program can continue to hold a physical place in the UC.

Name Change - Gym

Schlereth noted that the Campus Planning Committee will soon be meeting to discuss accepting the designation "Wolves Den" as the new name of the University's gym.

Summer Painting Program

Schlereth indicated that the Summer Painting Program has provided an opportunity for summer jobs for students. As a result of a complaint filed by the SETC Union, this program will be abandoned this summer and the campus will post for hire four full time temporary painter positions. The student positions will still be allowed to conduct preparation work but not the actual painting. A positive outcome will consist of the creation of four local jobs during the summer period.

Quality Improvement Initiative

Administration and Finance historically tracked various products and services related to a specific standard of achievement. The division is looking to develop this type of list once again, including publishing the rates charged for these items. This process will first start with the products and services that are provided to students. Jason Wenrick is heading this effort in the CMS office and volunteers may be utilized as "secret shoppers" to test the published rates.

Schlereth added that the division is also developing focus groups to look at how to improve services in the areas of Dining Services and the Bookstore. In particular, the focus groups will be looking at how to improve the student experience. Perry Marker stated that he hoped faculty would be involved in these discussions because referring to the treatment of students as customers undermines the relationship between the professors and the students.

Areas of Recent Concern

Schlereth addressed a few areas of recent concern on the campus:

GMC Hospitality Center

It should be discussed whether opening a restaurant in the Hospitality Center in the near future makes sense given the current economic outlook. Susan Moulton added that perhaps a budget and business plan for the Hospitality Center would help clarify things. Tim Wandling added that many individuals are concerned about what would happen to their areas' budget should the GMC project fail or become a financial strain. Moulton added that there are currently limited resources to maintain the mission and the campus community is concerned with the survival of classes and programs. Schlereth stated that Neil Markley is responsible for oversight of the Hospitality Center and he has been focused on making it a financially viable entity so it does not become a financial drain on the campus and also does not take attention and resources away from the University Center project.

Discussion ensued relating to facilitating campus discussions on the topic of the GMC through communication at the Academic Senate, AS Senate, Town Hall meetings or other areas. Courtney Buljan stated that the Town Hall meetings are a good idea but not many students attend and the students must first be educated before building interest on these topics.

North Tower

Construction of the North Tower at the North Entrance to the campus was discussed extensively in the CPC but this information was not well disseminated to the campus community. Sue Hayes referenced a recent accident occurring at the North Entrance and expressed her concern over the increased use of this entrance and thus greater possibility for additional incidents. Schlereth responded that it would cost approximately \$250K to \$300K to construct a stop light at that intersection. Normally it would be under the purview of Sonoma County or the City of Rohnert Park but their funds are currently not sufficient to address the issue. Eduardo Ochoa suggested inserting a stop sign instead of a stop light. Moulton suggested looking into placing additional signage at the North Entrance. Schlereth agreed to put a group together to discuss developing a solution to this issue. Dan Condron added that a sub-committee of the Rohnert Park City Council currently reviews these types of issues so this could serve as a vehicle for communication with the city and their traffic engineers. He also suggested discussing this topic at an upcoming GMC Working Group meeting. Schlereth requested that Derek Pierre obtain the students' general viewpoint on the issue through discussion at the Fee Advisory Committee.

Hiring Freeze

Within the context of the Academic Senate, there have been allegations that the A&F division is not following the campus Hiring Freeze. Susan Moulton mentioned that these

concerns will likely increase as the economy worsens. Scott Miller and Moulton suggested discussing this topic at the upcoming Town Hall Meeting on the Budget.

Academic Senate Resolution regarding Barnes & Noble link

Schlereth noted that a recent Academic Senate Resolution proposes adding language describing that choices other than B&N exist for students when purchasing textbooks. The CMS group is working with Peoplesoft to insert language on the textbook link. Schlereth added that B&N also announced an initiative that it is willing to match any textbook price. Markley noted that the price matching is for physical book store prices only.

Fridays at Four

FAASSU, the Filipino-American Association of Sonoma State University, will be present at today's Fridays at Four gathering. FAASSU will be providing information on their organization and are also involved in developing the menu of food being offered.

CSUEU Letter

Schlereth disclosed that he recently received a letter from the CSUEU. In summary, the letter declared that the CRC should cease and desist in discussing any issues affecting bargaining unit employees or have all members of bargaining units be removed from the CRC. Schlereth noted that the Academic Senate precedes the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) and thus believed the Academic Senate should still be represented at CRC. In addition, CSUEU does not have jurisdiction over CFA.

III. FINANCE

(Please see the March 27, 2009 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth discussed various items related to the financial status of the campus.

Endowment Spending Policy

Schlereth noted that the current policy of the Foundation is to distribute an amount equal to or greater than the prior year in order to obtain a level of predictability and reliability. This is not a typical policy throughout higher education and thus Patricia McNeill requested that the Foundation look into revising the policy and create a more common and understandable method. Schlereth mentioned that there are two main items to keep in mind in developing a spending policy: (1) to provide a reliable payout for current recipients and (2) to maintain the purchasing power of the endowment over time, a concept known as maintaining intergenerational equity.

The Foundation has been working with its primary financial advisor, the Commonfund, in adopting an appropriate spending model. The model that has emerged for adoption is based on a formula of 4% of a five year rolling average of the market value of the pooled endowment. The five year valuation period will allow for smoothing of distributions but

could still result in years where the current year distribution is smaller in dollar terms than a prior year distribution. The main recipients of the pooled endowment distribution were generally supportive of this method but apprehensive of having a policy which could result in years with a smaller distribution. This led to the concept of building a "rainy day fund" which could be spent from to fill the distribution gap during down years. This would require putting funds aside during years with greater than expected investment earnings. This account would consist of safe and secure investments with the primary objective of maintaining the value of the principle. This concept will be brought forward to the SSUAF Board. Mike Kiraly mentioned that from the perspective of the Library, the endowment distribution funds are relied upon and thus a level of predictability is important.

Schlereth discussed bringing forward a similar concept to the PBAC in terms of creating a rainy day fund for the University as a whole. The CSU now allows campuses to keep up to 3% of their budget in a reserve. He is planning on discussing the creation of a "fund balance/savings account" that could be accessed during down times.

Marker asked if the idea of a reserve is necessary considering that we are currently experiencing a historic downturn and it seems as though we were able to weather the normal downturns in the past. Bill Ingels responded that the aftermath of the tech bubble burst in 2000 did present a similar problem and this can occur more frequently than is often thought and we should be planning for future downturns.

Ochoa added that in terms of the Foundation, this is a narrowly targeted fund in order to use retained earnings to backup downturns. For the campus as a whole, this account would be distinguished from the current \$625,000 University reserve in that it would not be a permanent funding source but instead would be an account which carries over from year to year to be used for a rainy day instead of current needs. Schlereth mentioned perhaps raising the \$625,000 reserve to \$800,000 and then the excess monies remaining in a year could be placed in a separate rainy day fund that would sit in a secure account and earn interest.

2009-2010 Budget Planning

Schlereth discussed the operating budget challenges facing the University in 2009/10. The overall net decrease to the SSU Operating Budget is now estimated at \$2,735,000 as a result of imposed cuts and campus priorities. It is likely that this figure will only grow due to additional State deficits and also depends on the outcome of the May ballot measures. Schlereth added that he is worried the divisions are not prepared to address budget reductions of this magnitude.

Schlereth also discussed additional non-operating budget challenges in 09/10, including funding the Foundation endowment distribution, athletic scholarships, classroom renovations, and an operating deficit in Extended Education. Schlereth added that he is looking to address the issue with athletic scholarships in A&F and not pass the burden

on to the remainder of the campus. It may also be the case that the classroom renovation program does not take place in 09/10. Wandling asked if these renovations include technology upgrades. Schlereth responded that \$200,000 is funded from CSU Minor Capital Outlay funding and \$100,000 is funded from the A&F Division to cover the technology upgrades. However, no bond was issued to fund the 09/10 CSU Minor Capital Outlay program and thus there are no funds to pass along to the campuses. This item will also be discussed later in the agenda. These items add an additional estimated \$2.2M in budget challenges, bringing the combined estimated shortfall to around \$4.5M for 09/10.

Budget Reduction Strategies – Campus Budget Forum Suggestions

The committee reviewed and discussed the remaining budget mitigation items to be analyzed by A&F which had been generated by a brainstorming session at a previous Town Hall meeting on Budget. Some items are currently being done or are to be accepted, others were not accepted, and some are to be further analyzed by the appropriate parties for possible implementation.

IV. MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

Schlereth noted that there are a many areas throughout the Division where retirements are expected in the near future. Traditionally it would be the practice to wait for these employees to retire and then post the position for hire for a review of both internal and external candidates. The Management Training Program offers an alternative in that it allows the Division to promote current staff employees. Schlereth added that with the prior Trainees, communication has not been fully clear that these positions are in fact a management level job with management level duties. The option could be determined whether to open the Management Trainee positions to external candidates or to current faculty members. The program will not be utilized in 09/10 but this will be a discussion topic in the future. Peter Neville suggested omitting or changing the word “training” as it gives off a certain inaccurate perspective of the individuals in the program. Moulton explained that a concern exists of faculty teaching students who may receive a higher compensation than they do.

V. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

(Please see the March 27, 2009 agenda packet for related documents)

Schlereth mentioned that Hannah previously emailed the entire IT report to all CRC members. A summary of the recommendations provided in that report were reviewed. The high priority items were discussed and include:

- *Create an IT Advisory Board. See section VI below.*
- *Assign authority and responsibility of all campus IT resources and policies to CIO.*

- *Communicate the difference between core and non-core IT services.* Sam Scalise will be communicating to the campus the difference between the two services so people understand what can be expected from IT.
- *Reduce the number of IT operating units from six to two: (1) Technology Infrastructure and (2) User Services.* The number of director positions will correlate with this structure. Ochoa mentioned that having only one unit to handle all users may reduce focus on the smaller groups and suggested creating a separate Academic Technology services unit. Scalise responded that these units will be broken out by area, with different IT personnel still heading each area.
- *Develop and maintain an Annual Instructional Technology Operational/Strategic Plan in collaboration with the Provost and Director of the Center for Teaching and Professional Development.* This plan was recently emailed to the campus community by Susan Kashack for campus comment.
- *Add 3-4 instructional technology designers.* These positions are to be used to support faculty in the use of instructional technology.
- *Re-align remote servers to fall within the purview of IT security and network architecture.* This item should result in cost savings as a result of consolidation and centralization.
- *Solve the \$833,000 structural deficit in IT.* Schlereth committed funding for this deficit from future growth money to the Division.

VI. IT ADVISORY BOARD

Ochoa and Scalise will reflect on the makeup of this group and how it will relate to the current Academic Technology Advisory Board since most of the recommendations are academically related. Schlereth added that the logical first agenda item for the IT Advisory Board should consist of analyzing these assessment recommendations. After a recommended membership list is developed, it should be brought to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. Scalise also requested to make a presentation on IT initiatives and changes at a future CRC meeting. Moulton suggested that having a similar presentation made to the Academic Senate may be beneficial as well.

VII. PROGRESS WITH ASSESSMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

(Please see the March 27, 2009 agenda packet for related documents)

A summary of the assessment recommendations related to Human Services and Entrepreneurial Activities were provided in the packet but not discussed.

VIII. CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY SUB-COMMITTEE

IX. CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY SUB-COMMITTEE – DEANS/PROVOST INPUT

Schlereth commented that the Classroom Renovation Committee, a sub-committee of the CRC, currently looks at renovations but it may be appropriate to form a new group which would advise on what types of classroom technology are needed throughout the campus. Schlereth suggested that perhaps this could be a sub-committee or task force of the soon to be developed IT Advisory Board/Committee (ITAC). Schlereth added that \$100,000 is set aside annually from A&F for classroom technology refresh. Ochoa declared that it would be most appropriate if Academic Affairs were designated to provide the approach for Administration and Finance to work with and implement. Schlereth added that this would be beneficial so that the CPDC folks would not be receiving different views from the Deans and faculty as to the classrooms with the greatest need for renovating. Thus, the current process of a sub-committee of the CRC developing these recommendations would need to change. Ben Ford believed that the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) would be the proper body to analyze this. Schlereth agreed but added that Carol Ingerman and Nate Johnson should also be on this committee. Ochoa noted that it will still need to be determined whether it makes sense to combine ATAC and ITAC into one committee.

Scalise noted that frequently professors are unaware of how to get the equipment to work since there are varying levels of IT equipment sophistication among the classrooms. Wandling suggested posting a document in each classroom instructing the user how to use that particular machine.

X. DIVISION DIVERSITY INITIATIVES

Item deferred.

XI. DIVISION STRATEGIC PLANNING

(Please see the March 27, 2009 agenda packet for related documents)

Item deferred.

Schlereth adjourned the meeting at 3:55 pm.

Minutes prepared by Ian Hannah.