

Budget and Planning Committee Minutes

Academic Senate, CSU, Bakersfield

Thursday, October 27th, 2022
10:00 –11:30 AM

SCI 3-100 or Zoom

Present: Andrea Anderson, Amanda Grombly, Vernon Harper (ex officio), Natasha Hayes (ex officio, for Thom Davis), Aaron Hegde (ex officio), Luis Hernandez, Jackie Kegley, Charles Lam (Chair), Ilaria Pesco, Tracey Salisbury, Adam Sawyer, Carson Vollmer, and Di Wu.

I. Call to order – 10:03 AM by Chair Charles Lam

II. Approval of Minutes

1. Minutes from October 13th, 2022

Discussion: none

Action: Jackie K. moves to approve minutes, Amanda G. seconds, all in favor.

III. Approval of Agenda

Discussion: none

Action: Jackie K. moves to approve agenda, Di W. seconds, all in favor.

IV. Introductions / Announcements

VI. New Business

V. Old Business

1. 2021-22 Referral 02 – Department Formation Criteria – Edits after first reading

Discussion: Document can be found under the BPC BOC folder. The first revision was made under “II. New Department Proposal: Contents” on page three, “B. Faculty composition” was rewritten to be clearer for what is needed and what should be included in points (a) and (b) within point (1). The second revision was made under “III. New Department Proposal: Procedure for Review” on page five, point (5) was moved up and added to the description of point (A), and point (6) was renamed point (5). If no more changes are suggested, this version will be sent over to the senate.

Action: BPC will forward Referral 02 to the Senate, with revisions.

2. Referral 01 – Time Blocks and Space Utilization – Melissa Danforth, Space Management Committee

Discussion: Time blocks are currently not being used efficiently, reflecting an underutilization within the chancellor’s office reports. The committee

received feedback from DCLC, Kelly O'Bannon, and Tommy Holiwell; most chairs seem to prefer moving away from 50-minute time blocks in the mornings and making them one and a half-hour time blocks. The Communications Department is an exception, they prefer the 50-minute time blocks.

- Melissa presented time block data from before the Pandemic (2018-19) available in BOX. On Monday/Wednesday, the 2pm and 5pm blocks had spikes in utilization, while on Tuesday/Thursday, the 11am, 2pm, and 5pm blocks had spikes in utilization, with an expected Drop in utilization on Fridays.
 - There are too many classes scheduled between 10am and 5pm.
 - Please note that lectures scheduled in research labs or conference rooms (rooms not coded for lecture) are not captured in the utilization metrics for the chancellor's office.
- Chancellor's office uses two methods for utilization: 1) the 24/7 method which looks at how frequently rooms are being utilized altogether, and 2) the legislative analyst's office (LAO) requirement which looks at lecture room utilization between 8am and 10pm M-F, and lab rooms between 8am and 5pm M-F.
 - We cannot get our next building in the campus master plan if we keep underutilizing our time blocks.
 - Some underutilization is due to space errors in the database, or not utilizing time blocks outside of the 10am to 5pm M-Th blocks.
- Charles shared the utilization metrics document found in BOX to discuss what other CSU campuses are doing with time blocks.
 - CSU San Marcos factors in two 10-minute breaks into labs to extend their utilization.
 - CAL POLY SLO factors in a 10-minute break into the class time to extend their utilization.
 - Feedback from department chairs suggested making one-day a week classes 3-hour blocks (factoring in break times).
- Melissa mentioned that morning time blocks can be stitched together if a class needs more time, such as a one a week class that needs three hours and can pair up with another class that also needs three hours, to reflect the proper space utilization.
- Charles asked if the provost plans on replacing the position left by Lisa Z.; the plan to replace that position is still pending.
- Charles shared our current time block schedule (Schematic of Draft-4 class meeting times proposal) found in BOX:
 - The goal is to remove MWF 50-minute time blocks and make all MW TTH time blocks 75 minutes or
 - Labs would start at 8am instead of 7:20am
 - No likely Friday restrictions (meaning that Friday classes can be scheduled in various time blocks).
- Vernon mentioned that The California Code requires a certain amount

of seat-time for class; so we need to clarify by “no restrictions on Fridays”

- Charles mentioned that we can create Friday time blocks such as what CAL POLY SLO uses.
- Ilaria mentioned that not having intentional Friday time blocks may result in a M-Th campus; if students get into the mindset that their weekend starts on Thursday night, there could be more problems with the residence halls (including drinking issues).
 - The concern is that the way the current proposal for time blocks is going, it suggests we are getting rid of Friday classes and favoring M-Th classes only. From a utilization perspective, we have to make sure Friday classes are scheduled, however, 50-minute blocks are not working.
- Melissa shared that in the current time blocks, people wanting the 75-minute time blocks seem to prefer TTh and avoiding MWF.
- Tracey would like the campus to be surveyed for “cultural change”; Who gets to make decisions on scheduling in our current climate?
 - Also, we have to consider part-time lecturers may have jobs that keep them from teaching before 5pm.
 - Faculty entitlement is also part of the cultural change; those who are set in their ways and used to teaching only during the days and times they want.
- Ilaria: we also have to consider evening classes for our working students, especially for those who work 40 hours a week. Evening classes and Friday classes may fit their schedules better.
- Charles shared the Take-out Tuesday survey sent by Carson: students were asked about class time preferences and campus time preferences, please review the survey found in BOX.

Action: We do not have a new schedule to work with at the moment, Charles and Melissa will put together a draft for discussion on our next meeting (involving Tommy and Faust).

3. Referral 07 – Academic Advising Task Force

Discussion: n/a

Action: n/a

VII. Business On Hold

1. Referral 05 – Reclassification of AVP IRPA

Discussion: n/a

Action: n/a

VII. Open Forum

Discussion: Charles mentioned that we will get an update on referral 07 for discussion on our next meeting. The calendar committee will also finalize the 2023-24 and 2024-25 academic proposed calendar for discussion, two weeks from this meeting. We will tackle referral 07 and the academic calendar before getting back to the discussion on referral 02.

VIII. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at: 11:22am