Members Present: Jennifer Aceves (guest), Joe Alexander, Sharon Barrios, Ken Chapman, Dave Daley, Michael Guzzi, Ben Juliano, Frank Li, Brent Liotta (for Mike Magrey), Kate McCarthy, Patrick Newell, Steve Robinow, Clare Roby, Deborah Summers, Richard Tafalla, Matt Thomas, Karen vonBargen, Jed Wyrick, Jennifer Mays, Tom Ussery, Kathleen Gentry

1. Call to Order – 10:02

2. Approval of Minutes – minutes approved

   a. Provost Larson has added her revisions. No further input has been suggested so we now consider this document to be final.

4. Update on the SSKU move plan
   a. The original estimate of $1.2M was low, however a new estimate is not yet available.

5. Call for 2018 Summer Projects
   a. We see no new project requests in the system, however Steve Robinow said he has submitted two. We will investigate this.
   b. Not having several requests is actually not a bad thing considering how much of next summer will be spent dealing with SSKU.

6. Discussion on lecture space assignment/reassignment – “ownership”
   a. Tom did some checking and cannot find any information or documentation that defines how space has historically been assigned, therefore we need to develop procedures for assigning space and for planning. We have been in reactive mode for the last several building projects and we need to proactively plan for major projects.
   b. Tom and Mike Guzzi discussed the BUTE Hall Renovation, which we now understand may be funded in 2018-19, with work to tentatively take place
in 2019-20 and 2020-21. BUTE has 26 lecture spaces and 6 labs with a total course count of 200.

c. We distributed the SUAM space standards a week or so ago in preparation for discussion regarding the utilization information that is now available in FacilitiesLink. An excel sheet was presented showing lecture space utilization information from FacilitiesLink and was discussed at length. The CO’s requirement is 66% utilization based on 53 hours per week. Topics and suggestions were as follows:

i. Flexibility – the 17 additional sections of remedial math that the CO has asked for were used as an example along with the aforementioned BUTE Hall renovation.

ii. Automated scheduling via current or new software to assist Jennifer Aceves (funding would need to be identified to either hire an assistant for her or buy new software). Tom and Ben will discuss software options.

iii. Concerns were raised about assumptions being made in the current utilization model that may not work for faculty. Is Saturday included in these assumptions? We’re only looking at lecture space not labs here. Are there certain days/times that are not being utilized? It’s hard to ask for additional funding for buildings if our current space is not being fully utilized.

iv. We need to understand how current scheduling is being done and what factors will go into it before we create any formulas.

1. Flexibility – will new software support this? PAC144 looks available quite a bit of time but is actually in use, just not by classes but by students and staff preparing the room for performances in the afternoons

2. Space conditions/comfort/occupancy restrictions such as the State Fire Marshal (over-enrollment emails are sent based on SFM)

3. Course certifications that dictate how courses must be taught

4. Pedagogies/how to physically improve spaces for pedagogical needs

5. Night classes, weekend classes, alternate schedules such as Monday/Thursday, Tuesday/Friday, with Wednesday as a half day with time in the afternoon for meetings, etc., classes starting at 8:30 instead of 8:00, constraints due to possibly outdated scheduling conventions (the 4th year drop-out rate is high and may be due to the unavailability of classes)
a. We might begin with the 8:30 scheduling as a test and if it doesn’t work we could go back – this could also start to shift the paradigm – the underlying structural changes would have to be discussed first.

b. It gets much darker much earlier in the fall due to the time change and could affect later classes, especially at the Farm.

c. Please send additional suggestions to Tom.

6. Constraints/trends

7. Energy efficiencies

8. Course caps and space occupancies

9. Jennifer Aceves will ask the department ASCs for the rationale for scheduling in their respective areas - most scheduling is a repeat of prior semesters.

10. Dave suggested a brief questionnaire to help streamline gathering input from the Chairs.

v. Patrick asked how funding decisions are prioritized. Mike G. said that we are using the campus master plan. A new plan will be developed starting in January. A schedule will be published and there will be plenty of opportunities for input. It’s an 18-month process and he’s already going through the RFP process now.

vi. Sharon asked how other campuses manage space. It’s pretty much all over the board. Dave stated finding middle ground is possible.

vii. We could use the remedial math example as a catalyst to work out this process to prevent the reactivity.

viii. Kate offered up three points to consider and discuss:

1. Ownership – we have no history

2. Efficiency – why are we scheduling the way we are

3. Planning Process – how do we do this in a transparent, collaborative way

ix. Ownership is really just a factor in the first round of scheduling.

x. Jennifer Aceves will be sending more denials for jumbos due to SSKU

xi. There was a request to have the formulas available so members can fully understand the calculations and crunch numbers on their own.
7. Adjournment – 11:00

Upcoming Dates:

- Next meeting – 12/12/17 10:00 am SSC122/124
  - Action items due for 12/12
    - Jennifer Aceves to request scheduling rationale from department ASCs
    - Tom Ussery, Ben Juliano and Jennifer Aceves to review scheduling software
    - Associate Deans to request scheduling rationale from department Chairs
    - Tom Ussery to contact members for input on Chair’s & ASC’s questionnaires