



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY BAKERSFIELD

AY 2025-2026 Budget and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 5, 2026

10:00 am – 11:30 am

Stiern Library, Ablin Conference Room and Zoom

Present: A. Grombly (chair), J. Florez (alternate), D. Wu, R. Dugan, D. Horn, Y. Ko, L. Hernandez, H. Gonzalez, M. Ramirez, D. Thien (ex-officio), N. Hayes (ex-officio), M. Danforth (ex-officio)

Absent: A. Lauer

I. Call to Order

1. Meeting started at 10:02 a.m.

II. Approval of Agenda (time certain: 10:05 am)

2. Motion to approve by L. Hernandez, seconded by H. Gonzalez – approved!

III. Approval of Minutes (time certain: 11:00 am)

1. Minutes from February 5, 2026: *tabled*
2. Minutes from February 19, 2026: in progress – *tabled*

IV. Announcements

1. Questions for the budget forum were submitted to the CFO and the Budget Office this week.
 - A. Grombly noted that the questions were condensed from two pages, down to the six questions, as many were largely procedural.
 - A. Grombly noted that not all items fall under the Budget Office's purview, but they were addressed because concerns were raised.
 - M. Danforth noted that emotions were because a notice was sent to CFA, and this may bubble up at the Budget Forum.
 - D. Thien (Provost) clarified that it was not a layoff notice. It was a notification that there may be the possibility of a layoff.
 - Y. Ko shared that some faculty initially interpreted the notice as "pink slips," comparing the situation to high school lecturer assignments. Further noting that issues arise when there are insufficient sections, particularly for evening courses.
 - A. Grombly referenced CBA Article 38, which governs order of assignment. The notice communicates that there is a potential for layoffs, not an actual layoff.
 - M. Danforth described the situation as a "possibility, not a probability," using "math terms."
- It was noted that a department chair was reportedly in tears due to separate communication indicating a required reduction equivalent to one lecturer's fall sections, highlighting the need for greater transparency.
- D. Thien (Provost) clarified that two facts can be true at the same time. Planning began with a budget higher than what the Chancellor's Office (CO) ultimately provided. Last year's target was 8542 FTES. Cabinet and President approved planning for 8,567 FTES, with a goal to fund 8,800 FTES, matching last year's delivered FTES. FTES funding is being provided up front to allow departments to plan earlier. Because the FTES base model is dynamic, not a static, "butts in seats" count, thus budget allocations may shift during the year.
- D. Thien (Provost) further noted that department-level impacts may vary; some may see declines while others see increases. Retrospective data does not fully predict future enrollment; projections remain uncertain.

M. Danforth emphasized the need for IRPA to incorporate unmet student demand, not just filled seats, into the budget model.

D. Thien (Provost) added that beyond waitlists, DFW rates should also be considered.

R. Dugan noted that FTES is influenced by internal structural changes such as dual enrollment and GE modifications, which must also be factored into planning.

D. Thien (Provost) stated that GE requirements have changed significantly over the past decade and asked the group to consider whether GE projections are being incorporated into planning, as we need to ensure that we are providing these courses.

A. Grombly noted that the committee was tasked with program discontinuation discussions. Focusing solely on GE could negatively impact major programs such as Anthropology and Religious Studies.

Y. Ko asked whether GE could be structured differently by college, noting that engineering programs face accreditation constraints and limited unit flexibility.

M. Danforth clarified that GE is governed by Title V, the curriculum committee is overseen by the Academic Senate. Title V requires GEMs or modified requirements. The CO is moving toward requiring each lower-division GEM to align with a specific lower-division GE course, leaving little flexibility.

A. Grombly added that space constraints further complicate scheduling, making uniformity across semesters unrealistic.

2. **Meeting agenda note:** A number of curriculum proposals have been pulled or placed on hold for revisions. We may actually get to the time block situation. Will limit discussion to accommodating courses without existing time blocks (like 4-unit courses). More information to come.

A. Grombly noted that three proposals were placed on hold for various reasons.

A. Grombly brought up time blocks, specifically for courses that currently do not have designated scheduling slots, specifically 4-unit courses.

Concerns were raised about space utilization, runner hours, and overall scheduling efficiency.

Y. Ko noted that he feels as though 4-unit courses require justification from the Mathematics department, however clarified that current practice involves using one classroom from morning through afternoon to minimize space utilization.

A. Grombly indicated that this approach may not be sustainable in the future, particularly with the introduction of new scheduling software and the new building. She further emphasized the need to formalize a consistent structure for time blocks rather than relying on ad hoc arrangements.

M. Danforth reported that numerous small scheduling overlaps (5–15 minutes) between activities are occurring. These overlaps create barriers for students attempting to enroll in required courses. She stressed the need to address structural time block issues to prevent these conflicts.

D. Thien (Provost) stated that no classes or activities should be scheduled in overlapping time blocks.

M. Danforth agreed to send an overlap documentation report to A. Grombly upon returning home.

A. Grombly noted she is preparing a document for D. Thien (Provost), which will include an executive summary of past efforts.

D. Thien (Provost) noted that AI assistance may be used to help generate the summary.

J. Flores noted that we have been having ongoing campus-wide discussions regarding space utilization, and new allocations to campus depend on this.

A. Grombly shared that prior Provost gave instructions to reduce the level of scheduling off the time blocks, however there wasn't enough data to review based on that one year.

R. Dugan noted that faculty need to be more willing to schedule beyond the preferred "golden hour".

M. Danforth noted that part of this is a DCLC conversation. There needs to be great flexibility – morning, afternoon, evening options.

D. Thien (Provost) is confident that this is the committee that is going to move this forward. Further noting that it doesn't have to be perfect, but it can be better than what we have now.

V. Old Business

1. Referral #2025-2026 36 New Degree Proposal BS in Environmental Science (time certain: 10:05 am)

Guest speakers: A. Rathburn & other department members

Geology Department guest speakers: Anthony Rathburn, Mathew Herman, and William Krugh

A. Rathburn addressed concerns that have been raised regarding workload. He noted that the program is exciting and highly interdisciplinary, involving multiple departments. Because students can choose from many disciplinary pathways, workload becomes diluted across departments. An increase in enrollment would further dilute workload distribution.

A. Rathburn further acknowledged faculty support, including the NSME chairs council, where faculty were provided an opportunity to discuss and express their concerns.

A. Rathburn noted that letters of support were written in April/May 2025, after the Instructional Budget Model was introduced. Additionally, the curriculum committee and Chemistry department provided a unanimous vote of approval.

M. Herman noted that the Environmental Resources Group (A. Hegde) also reviewed and supported the proposal. All groups involved provided a seal of approval.

A. Rathburn next addressed concerns about consumables, lab fees, and equipment.

A. Rathburn confirmed that all courses using consumables either already have lab fees or will have them added. Lab fees are required because the department does not have the resources to cover consumables otherwise.

W. Krugh noted that all course fee changes go through the standard course fee proposal process.

H. Gonzalez inquired about additional equipment maintenance as referenced in the proposal.

M. Herman confirmed that lab fees typically cover maintenance.

A. Rathburn noted that for larger equipment needs, they coordinate directly with the Dean. Research funds and grants cover the acquisition of research-related equipment.

A. Rathburn emphasized enthusiasm for the program but noted concerns about budget constraints. Further noting that all classes already exist, either within their department or in collaborating departments. All current resources will remain available as they are now.

A. Grombly raised concerns about resource sharing across departments; Rathburn noted that cross-department collaboration is actually an advantage.

A. Grombly noted that T. Tsantsoulas will communicate regarding when the proposal moves to Senate.

A. Rathburn expressed a desire for the proposal to move forward promptly.

M. Danforth recommended following up with Dean Adams to ensure the courses are added to CSU Apply as soon as possible, since they may not appear at launch without early action.

Geology guests left at 10:14 a.m.

A. Grombly asked if there was any feedback on the proposal, noting that AAC has written the proposal and it's in the Box folder for review. Their rationale is lengthy.

A. Grombly expressed concern about the use of the word "sufficient" in the proposal. She feels "existing" is more definitive and clearly communicates that the program can be supported with current resources. Should we consider "available," "existing," or similar wording.

H. Gonzalez noted that every level of review references academic sufficiency, and from the BPC perspective, there are no concerns. Current equipment and resources are adequate to support the program.

A. Grombly asked whether the group is comfortable keeping “sufficient resources” or if the language should be updated. General agreement leaned toward “existing resources” as the preferred phrasing.
D. Thien (Provost) indicated that the maximum amount of localized student fees is \$150 before a proposal must be elevated for additional review. Discussion centered on whether fees count as resources when describing program support.
H. Gonzalez clarified that fees are indeed considered resources, and the department currently has enough to support the program as written.
Group discussion with the preference to revise proposal language to emphasize existing resources rather than “sufficient resources.” No concerns identified regarding academic or equipment support at the BPC level. Fee structure is within allowable limits and contributes to the resource base.

Motion to approve with changes by H. Gonzalez, seconded by Y. Ko – approved!

2. Referral #2025-2026 39 Proposal for New Minor Sociology Migration, Population, and Globalization

A. Grombly noted that R. Dugan is still serving on AAC. She referenced the program administration site
A. Grombly recalled prior discussions but noted some details were unclear and needed confirmation.
L. Hernandez confirmed the university currently has three thematic minors.
M. Danforth clarified that thematic minors must include three areas of focus, consistent with GE AMS program structure and requires 12 units.
It was reiterated that thematic minors must be GE programs.
A. Grombly reminded the group that previous discussions emphasized increasing enrollment in certain classes by creating the minor. The goal is to strengthen enrollment in courses already being offered.
D. Thien (Provost) asked the committee to reflect on its purpose. The committee’s role is to weigh in on budget and resource matters, not to determine curricular specifics. The focus should be on whether the proposing department has considered the necessary resource implications.
Y. Ko asked whether the committee functions as an approving body or an advising body.
M. Danforth clarified that the committee is a standing body of the Senate. It is required to review resource requests and is responsible for evaluating budget, resource, and planning implications.
M. Danforth asked whether there is space available in the current schedule to support the minor.
D. Thien (Provost) asked whether departments have determined personnel impacts and how the minor affects existing staffing.
A. Grombly asked whether the minor would affect the current course rotation.
M. Danforth emphasized the need for clarity on whether the minor would require additional classes, personnel, or other resources.
M. Danforth added that resource considerations extend beyond supplies to include sections offered and faculty needed.
A. Grombly asked what questions the committee should consistently raise for other referrals, and what must be included in CourseLeaf. She will follow up with Dean Adams to ensure required information is captured.
Y. Ko noted concerns that some courses included in the minor are already being offered without sufficient FTES to support them. This raises questions about sustainability and departmental capacity.
R. Dugan arrived at 10:35 a.m.
A. Grombly clarified that the committee does not need to include staff or personnel decisions in its review. If Deans sign off, they have delegated authority (DOA) over resource commitments. However, she did note that the Library Dean must explicitly support any library resource needs associated with the proposal.

Y. Ko concluded that the committee supports the proposal as it stands, noting that efforts were made to open new courses for the minor. The committee reaffirmed its responsibility to ensure proposals are thoughtfully prepared with clear attention to budget, resources, and planning.

M. Danforth reiterated that the committee functions as a review body. If a proposal is missing a resource consideration, the committee is responsible for identifying it.

Y. Ko noted that the Dean ultimately bears responsibility for supporting the program and ensuring resources are available.

M. Danforth emphasized that the committee's charge is to evaluate budget, resource, and planning implications, consistent with its role as a standing body of the Senate.

R. Dugan stated that the minor is intended to attract more students and help prevent course cancellations. Additional courses have already been added, and the department needed a macro-level view of course offerings. Courses will be offered at both campuses (AV/Main), expanding access.

R. Dugan explained that the proposal originally included the term "thematic" but was told to remove it. It was included initially to differentiate the minor, even though it was not considered "special" in a formal sense.

M. Danforth clarified that minors generally require fewer structural elements than majors or certificates.

R. Dugan noted that not all questions or requirements applicable to majors or certificates are relevant for a minor, and the committee should focus on if anything material is missing.

A. Grombly asked what specific questions should be applied to this minor and similar proposals. She will wait for AAC feedback and incorporate today's discussion into follow-up actions.

As a group it was discussed whether there were any concerns beyond confirming sufficient existing resources.

M. Danforth and others emphasized the importance of determining whether the minor requires: additional sections, additional personnel, additional resources beyond what is currently available.

Amanda reiterated the importance of ensuring that proposals include a clear plan, referencing past examples where long-term resource sustainability (e.g., after grant funding ends) was a concern.

The committee agreed to await AAC's next steps and confirmed that no additional concerns were raised beyond verifying existing resources.

Motion to approve moving forward by Y. Ko, seconded by J. Florez – approved!

R. Dugan abstained.

A. Grombly noted she will discuss with T. Tsantsoulas

3. **Referral #2025-2026 04 Time Blocks** - *tabled until curriculum proposals are complete*
4. **Referral #2025-2026 37 New Degree Proposal BS in Mechanical Engineering** – *on hold*

VI. Open Forum (Time Certain: 11:20 am)

1. L. Hernandez is taking meeting minutes next time.
2. J. Florez reminded the group that the Academic Freedom Panel is next Thursday, March 12th at 5:00 p.m. and it includes four individuals from the Budget Planning Committee.

VII. Adjourn

1. Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.