PRESIDENT’S REPORTS
President Rush gave a brief overview of the history of the Site Authority and the CI 2025 proposal that will be given to the CSU Board of Trustees in January. The plan is to maximize our assets, leverage them and produce revenue for the campus since we will not be given state support for building academic facilities.

POLICY

Recommendation: Policy on Subrecipient Monitoring (Jason Miller)
Jason Miller explained that this is the second reading of this policy and there were only some minor changes recommended by the Chancellor’s Office auditor. There were no changes to the process; articulations just needed to be made in the actual policy. The word “initial” was added to the annual risk assessment reference under the policy text. Under the roles and responsibilities of the Principal Investigator (PI), it now notes that the PI will manage the follow-up and monitoring for high-risk subawardees. Under the roles and responsibilities for Financial Services, it was clarified that the finance team reviews not only A-133 audits, but also any subaward-related documents. Lastly, a sentence was added to address high-risk subawardees without tying us to any specific monitoring activity.

Gayle Hutchinson motioned to approve and Nichole Ipach seconded. All council members approved the policy.
Recommendation: Policy on Principal Investigator Financial Conflict of Interest (Jason Miller)
Jason Miller reminded all that there was only one change that the auditor needed to have made. A sentence was added indicating that the campus’ Senior Research Officer (SRO), Jason Miller, is responsible for Ethics training and/or Responsible Conduct of Research Training on campus.

Jeanne Grier motioned to approve and Chanda Cunningham-Spence seconded. All council members approved the policy.

Jeanne Grier pointed out that both of these polices were also approved by the Academic Senate. They are the first example of co-policies between the Academic Senate and PPPC, so she will work with Melissa Remotti and Genevieve Evans Taylor on the numbering system for the new policy manual.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Strategic Resource Planning Task Force Update (Missy Jarnagin)
Missy Jarnagin reported that the task force met last week. They reviewed the charge of the committee, discussed next year’s enrollment projections at 3 percent, 5 percent and 8 percent. They also reviewed the fiscal year 2016 budget instructions that went out in the beginning of November. The Vice Presidents shared the development of their current requests, as these requests are due back to budget on February 9. Lastly, they talked about next steps, timelines and meeting structure.

Gayle Hutchinson added that divisions are prioritizing and using this task force body to get proposals in from divisions early so that we can gather input from faculty and staff so that they can review it prior to their next meeting. There is a vast improvement to the process this year.

Strategic Planning Update (Gayle Hutchinson)
Gayle Hutchinson first gave an update on the Fall faculty hiring process. She reported that searches took place for the following disciplines: art, biology, computer science, economics, finance, management, library, nursing, political science/public administration, psychology, sociology and the School of Education. They are in the process of negotiating and securing offers to candidates. The candidate for nursing declined, so that search will move to the spring semester. Political science/public administration will also be moved out to the spring. The spring search disciplines include: ESRM, early childhood development, health sciences, history, nursing, political science/public administration, and performing arts/dance.

Gayle was charged with going out into the community this fall with the strategic plan to get feedback. Over 200 people have been consulted in this process. There have been 3 community meetings thus far: Oxnard, Camarillo and Santa Barbara. Each location’s participants provided a different perspective on the strategic plan. The Oxnard participants were mostly from education (community college and school districts); Camarillo had industry partners; and Santa Barbara had a combination of some of our students from our campus in Goleta and Alan Hancock College students as well as Dr. Walthers, President of Alan Hancock College. Participants are all very excited and like the plan.
Gayle provided an overview of the plan and the group is close to giving their recommendation to President Rush. She noted that they worked hard at defining student success and student-centeredness. Each division will develop their own strategic plan. The Division of Academic Affairs will begin this process in the spring. It’s important that each division’s goals are developed around each strategic priority and that they do so in a way that is collaborative across units. The goal is to kick this off in the spring semester.

OTHER BUSINESS

CI 2025 (John Gormley)
John Gormley presented on the CI 2025 plan, acknowledging Dr. Rush’s earlier comments that this proposal will be presented to the CSU Board of Trustees in early January and that this presentation is intended as an outreach for feedback. Completion of the Phase I report is in draft form and will be on the website once it is finalized. John’s PowerPoint presentation can be found at http://www.csuci.edu/ci-2025/.

Jason Miller asked if there is any flexibility in the long-term plan for any opportunities that may arise in the future. John responded that it is has built-in flexibility to accommodate our future needs. John added that the housing market still appears to be good for us to be able to capitalize on the key revenue-generators on the east campus.

Chanda Cunningham-Spence asked about the types of housing that will be built. John responded that there are a variety of options that would transition some of the rental units to purchase and they are looking at the undeveloped area to build rental apartments. There would be a greater financial reward for the university using apartments. We would not be selling the property, just allowing a developer to come in so that there is no risk to the university. There is a high demand for apartments in the region and occupancy rates are at 97 percent in Ventura County.

Jason Miller asked if the plan addresses public access to the university, specifically parking and public transportation. John replied that we have very little control at this time over the various transportation authorities within the county. We need to continue to work with the various jurisdictions. We also do need to expand parking. Jason added that if the population of University Glen increases, then perhaps there may be more opportunity for resident public transportation. President Rush added that he discussed a number of possibilities with the head of the Transportation Commission. His vision is to have a number of alternative fuel vehicles on campus in the future.

The next PPPC meeting will be in Spring 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Alanna Trejo