



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO

Associate Deans-Support Unit Administrators

Space and Projects Working Group

Meeting Minutes

March 15, 2018

1:00 pm

ARTS228

Members Present: Joe Alexander, Jed Wyrick, Dave Daley, Steve Robinow, Tom Ussery, Patrick Newell, Richard Tafalla, Kate McCarthy, Mike Magrey, James Luyirika-Sewagudde, Jr. (for Frank Li), Kathleen Gentry

Members Absent: Melody Stapleton, Jennifer Aceves, Jim Pushnik, Ken Chapman, Jennifer Mays, Debbie Summers, Clare Roby, Jessica Bourne, Sharon Barrios, Matt Thomas, Karen vonBargen, Tom Rosenow, Michael Guzzi

1. Call to Order – 1:03 pm
2. Approval of Minutes – minutes from 2.15.18 approved
3. New Business
 - a. Alternative Course Scheduling – Jed Wyrick
 - i. Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard visited campus last week and spoke about the 6 pillars of the graduation initiative, once of which is more effective/efficient use of campus space and schedules. In particular, he mentioned scheduling Fridays, evening classes, finding out if faculty may be interested in teaching evenings, and even Saturday. In particular he mentioned offering classes when students can take them to have less conflicts and competition by having more offerings. Students may have other conflicts such as work which poses a problem with evening offerings.
 - ii. Loren was very excited that we were starting to look at data and we appear to be a bit ahead of the curve with this analysis. Kate mentioned the 8:00 higher DFW rate to Loren and he asked how we were going to address this. Jed answered, mentioning the concept of moving classes back to an 8:30 start date. That proposal (proposal #1 in the attachments sent for today's meeting) would by-and-large keep schedules as they are, just move them back a half-hour. The analysis shows a large pick-up in usage at 9:30 on T-R. Moving to 8:30 would provide an additional hour. Additionally, the M-W 4:00 slot could be moved to 3:30 to get in an extra 75 minute slot. Most chairs and faculty have expressed interest in the 75 minute slots. Jed did his best to explain this

concept to Loren. If this proposal is considered, we would have to start thinking about changing our culture to use greater parts of the day, especially later in the day.

- iii. Proposal #2 (in the attachments sent for today's meeting) would move to a M-R & T-F schedule pattern. Wednesday would be for special course offerings and from 12-5:30 there would be no scheduling for T/TT faculty for department/campus meeting scheduling. Wednesday mornings could be used for seminar-type classes. It's currently difficult to offer 2.5 hours classes at any point because it conflicts with the students ability to take classes at multiple, different times during the week and we don't have a good set up for when senior capstones would take place. Some of Jeff's data shows a weird fall-off with 4th year students who have almost all of the requirements for the degree can't get there, which may be due to work schedules. The idea of offering a 2.5 hour class during the day may prove to be interesting, but could be quite a challenge for both faculty and students. Lecturers could teach during the 12-5:30 time on Wednesdays. MCGS had some input that this would conflict with their schedule. Labs would not be included in this schedule. They would continue on as-is, depending on the DFW rate in the morning. There are some classes, fewer than you may think, where faculty are requesting three meeting sections per week, such as POLS155, HIST130 and a few other disciplines, so Wednesday morning or afternoon would work well for those classes. Some have observed that we're just moving Friday afternoon activities to Wednesday afternoon. Or Wednesday afternoon could be used for co-curricular activities, student services offering, student groups, student study groups, etc. This is not a comprehensive discussion of the possible benefits, but it covers most things. Staff will have a problem getting work completed if faculty are not here on Monday or Friday or both.
- iv. Dave asked specifically where we're at with this process. Jed said we're still just beginning to discuss this idea. AGR faculty intend to slowly start the dialogue at their meeting tomorrow. This idea may fit with some disciplines better than others. Technical courses statistically do not do as well with a 75-minute/2 days a week schedule. The Farm already struggles with scheduling labs. He suggested removing the language that indicates this would be for lower-division courses only. He'd like us to look at college-level data only, which Kate supported by requesting that more data be found. In AGR, students want more faculty contact, so the additional day without faculty available may not work as well for their college.
- v. Mike added that classroom support needs to be considered as part of this concept overall. He may have to change the way classroom coverage is available and there could be some impact on the technology itself. Some technology is already at the end of its

support life and it's likely there will be additional impacts on its life cycle. Night classes would require additional staff. However, it's all do-able.

- vi. Steve mentioned that GEOS/CHEM expressed lab concerns, which has already been addressed. CHEM prefers 50-minute sessions. He would think that disciplines that require a lot of repetition would prefer the 50-minute sessions as well. The additional hand-out provided shows the 50-minute blocks. A room could be sequestered and run continually for these disciplines. Steve asked about how many meeting times are available now. Jed mentioned that there seems to be a consistent lack of scheduling from 3-4 pm on M/W/F. Starting at 8:30 you would add an hour onto the end of the day. On our current schedule you would go from 8 slots to 6 slots on a 75-minute schedule. Steve pointed out you would still need 8 meeting times with the 75-minute slots. 5-6:15 would provide a 7th slot. Steve likes the morning start time adjustment but it doesn't change our density utilization of the campus. The only way you change utilization is to reduce the number of classes we have and offer the appropriate sized classes that we need. If you want to increase utilization you need to close something down, i.e., if we need more 80 seat classes, fewer 25 seat classes, etc. Jed said there are different ways of measuring utilization. One way is to look at it is "are we distributed across more spaces in the grid". Loren wants to look for more options for students to have to graduate. Steve said there is a perception that we are not meeting student demand for when classes are needed. Dave said we could go W/F with labs but doesn't think that would really change things much.
- vii. Richard asked if there's any evidence regarding students who are taking longer saying that it's due to lack of access to courses. At a previous institution they found that number of courses and timing was the issue with working students' inability to graduate on time. Dave added that many times it's a matter of course sequencing. It's human nature to put off the harder classes until later but that leads to schedule conflicts for students. Kate asked how we get data about students not making timely progress because they can't get the classes in its time/offering. Mike added his own personal experience of adding a second minor lead him to change his schedule. Kate added that students who change their majors on average of 3 times do not graduate later because of it. Those who come in undeclared have some of the best graduation rates. Jed asked if in the senior year classes tend to take on a different kind of scheduling, e.g., more 3-hour blocks, evening hours, etc. could that be part of the reason it takes them longer to graduate. Late changes in major do tend to slow things down.
- viii. Joe asked Jed about the discussion with Loren in regard to how we perceive graduation rates on this campus. He was told that really

what they're looking at is retention, not years. Jed said that Loren did recast the graduation initiative to help students graduate one semester earlier than they have up to this point (rather than getting students to graduate in 4 years).

- ix. Richard added that characteristics of students are changing. They are a lot more non-traditional so those dynamics can make scheduling much different today. Jed added that having more options would help. Richard said that 60% of the students at his prior institution worked full-time.
- x. Kate brought up the idea in proposal #2 of lecturers working on Wednesday afternoons to ensure it's presented appropriately and doesn't give the impression that lecturers are not welcome at department meetings. Jed said it could be taken out of the proposal altogether and left up to departments. Steve suggested picking a time slot where no classes were taught, so departments meetings could be scheduled at that time. Jed will revise the proposal to show a block time for meetings. Generally, this needs to be digested a bit more. AGR will have problems when it gets dark early in the fall.
- xi. Tom mentioned that Ken had expressed concern about this group meeting just to meet and what is the game plan. So, it's not just about CMT equipment, FMS support, CO utilization, students need to use spaces, it's all of that and more. This group needs to focus on what our true goal is to come up with findings to present before the end of the semester and have that plan in place. The group feels that having this plan figured out by the end of this semester is too fast. Dave suggested we approach this a bit more incrementally and focus on the first proposal since it's a bit more straightforward and easier to look at. Kate suggested charrettes to discuss it because there may be concerns raised about changing things again. Tom reiterated that this group started with facilities utilization, then it blended into graduation rates, it blended into equipment, then DFW rates. Kate wants us to find university level research to blend in with our data. We have campus data for the 9:00 time, but not for 8:30. Tom asked if we should leave the time schedule and change the courses scheduled at that time? Easier courses could be scheduled at 8:00. Steve said it would be problematic for science. Chairs tend to place required courses at 8:00. Richard asked if the less prepared students who are behind in scheduling get stuck in the 8:00 classes. So what are the goals of this committee? They have morphed into this scheduling topic but the committee was originally put together to talk about more efficient space utilization. Via an email, Melody asked Tom to discuss this topic, which will be on the next meeting's agenda. Tom said that many colleges are asking why other colleges have classes in their areas. So should the discussion about the schedule change move forward? This will also be on our next agenda.

- xii. Mike mentioned the budget situation will affect his department's ability to provide the technology that faculty need in the classrooms. He's working on an analysis for the provost.

b. Action Items

- i. Jed will revise the proposal to show a block time for meetings.
- ii. Jed or Kate to find university level data to blend with our data so we're comparing "apples to apples".

4. Old Business

a. Discussion Items – none discussed

b. Action Items – as follows including action items from prior meetings

- i. Mike G. will send out his draft access/security plan for review and discussion.
- ii. Mike G. to develop the project time line document for review and discussion.

5. Announcements - none

6. Adjournment at 2:00 pm

Upcoming Dates:

- 4.19.18 – next meeting, 1:00 pm, ARTS228