

Budget and Planning Committee Minutes

Academic Senate, CSU, Bakersfield

Thursday, September 15th, 2022

10:00-11:30 AM

In-Person and ZOOM

- I. **Call to order** – 10 AM by Chair Charles Lam
Present: Andrea Anderson, Amanda Grombly, Vernon Harper (ex officio), Aaron Hegde (ex officio), Luis Hernandez, Jackie Kegley, Charles Lam (Chair), Ilaria Pesco, Tracey Salisbury, Adam Sawyer, Carson Vollmer, and Harvey McCown for Di Wu. Absent: Di Wu, Thom Davis
- II. **Approval of Minutes & Agenda**
 1. Minutes from September 1, 2022
Motion: A. Grombly. C. Vollmer second. Approved.
 2. Agenda – approved.
- III. **Old Business**
 1. **Referral #02 Department Formation Criteria Revision.** Referral discussion continues from last meeting. Brief discussion about specific wording for president's level of review and decision. Discussion regarding recommendations, any level can recommend it be sent back, but should not require it in order to keep review moving forward. A. Hegde – each level of review has their own charge and should be trusted to thoroughly reviewed before passing on to next level. He noted that at general senate all documents are open and everyone is able to comment and give feedback. BPC finished revisions on the document and Chair Charles Lam will pass it on to EC.
 2. **Referral #05 Reclassification of AVP IRPA.** Reclassification was approved, but committee need information on the wording. V. Harper – Request is for the language in the handbook to reflect what currently exists or what they would like to exist. Separating the person from the role. The title of the agenda item gives the impression that the person is being reclassified, however it is about the language in the handbook being dated and giving a negative impression to candidates. V. Harper will draft/send over summary of job description and language for change. C. Lam – Will need another referral to change the language in the handbook, but the referral was approved. Discussion about task force for changes to handbook. Revision time could be lengthy.
 3. **Referral #01 Time Bocks and Space Utilization.** Charge is to consider issues regarding time/days for Time Blocks on MW, T TH, and F, impact of space utilization, and informing faculty of limited choice on when they teach.

Committee was given CSU report from F. Gorham which shows the space utilization of the campus reflecting the fall 2019 term enrollments. Committee agreed that more information is needed on most popular times for blocks and method used to calculate space utilization.

Lengthy discussion occurred on several issues:

- Accuracy of seat count within classrooms. Request that F. Gorham have seats counted to ensure accuracy and 25Live updated. Clarification needed on 24/7 method and use of this method.

- Scheduling. Some classes are over or under used. Utilization rate needs to bump up. Requests for more classrooms need to occur if there are not enough currently. Discussion of past classrooms, sizes, class size growth.
- Major criticisms of current issues. For many classes, 50 min does not work. Departments find it hard to schedule. Requirements for some departments overlap and so students are unable to graduate in a timely manner. Different depts with different needs. Appears to be less coordination amongst all departments as they schedule. Night classes often overlap, and students must choose which one to take.
- Time blocks should be focused on pedagogy. Request was made for data on students who have not been able to meet degree requirements because of overlapping classes they need to take.
- Departments with priority on spaces. Suggestions that some depts have priority in scheduling a time block. Culture on the campus needs to change. More transparency and organization amongst departments. A. Grombly suggests DCLC be consulted after this is completed.
- V. Harper explained our model of scheduling with “footprints.” Spaces that departments typically have control over, i.e., BPC building – business students/classes. Other models show no “footprints.” Suggestion that this be abandoned if its not valuable. Question of whether this model creates inefficiency. A. Grombly noted cross scheduling impacts student life.

To Do: C. Lam will request more information from F. Gorham. Tommy Holliwell will be consulted to provide information on space analyses/time block overlap. Examples of other universities who use this method will be explored. C. Vollmer suggested a survey for students to provide input on when they want to take classes.

Referral will be revisited at next meeting.

IV. New Business

- 1. Referral #07 Academic Advising Task Force Recommendations** – Charge to look into whether or not the current advising structure needs to change. See if recommendations are good and push forward.

Current issue: Many gaps in advising communication. Division of advising amongst faculty, specialty advisors is unclear.

Suggestion to have director of undergraduate advising and an advising counsel. Two different options were provided by the Advising Task Force Committee for reporting structure. Committee would like to thank the task force for developing and looking into all these options. A second report on Student Success Initiatives at CSUB was provided and laid out issues/analyses of data. Brief discussion on the cost of changing the structure, cost savings vs more costs. Committee will read both reports and discussion will continue with this referral at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at: 11:30.

Minutes submitted by Andrea Anderson 9/21/22