



ACADEMIC SENATE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/81291128392?pwd=MzhRMW50UUJJNIRaMWttMUVESTRSQT09>

In- Person: BPA 134 Conference Room

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), V. Harper, J. Rodriguez, C. Lam, N. Michieka, D. Solano, E. Correa, D. Wu, M. Rush and K. Van-Grinsven (Senate Analyst)

Guest: none

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
 - a. Honorary Doctorate Award
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain: 10:05 AM)
4. APPROVAL OF EC MINUTES
 - a. November 7, 2023 (**handout**) (tabled)
5. CONTINUED ITEMS
 - a. AS Log (**handout – EXCEL document**)
 - i. AAC (D. Solano)
 - ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
 - iii. BPC (D. Wu)
 - iv. FAC (M. Rush)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. Academic Affairs Pandemic Response Budget Advisory Task Force (**handout**)
 - ii. Reference Letters Policy- Link: Employment Policy Governing the Provision of Employee References <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/12142918/latest/>
 - iii. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (**HOLD- check with Provost**)
6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain: 10:45 AM)
 - a. Campus Climate Survey- Senate actionable items (**handout**)

- b. New Department Proposal – Public Health– **Link to BOX files:**
<https://csub.box.com/s/kibjg6yje7juuxm0dw3rscp3rwxhvvv4>
- c. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
 - i. Appointments:
 - 1. Budget and Planning Committee: **(handout)**
 - a. Jesse Bergkamp – Chemistry and Biochemistry
 - b. Anthony Bianchi – CEE/CS
 - c. David Gove- Mathematics
 - 2. IRPA Advisory Committee:
 - a. Md Abu Naser- Communications
 - ii. Distributed Learning Committee (DLC)
 - iii. U-wide RTP criteria taskforce (equity) (HOLD)
- d. Current SOCI Software replacement using Class Climate **(handout)**
- e. Capturing Critical Positions
- f. Considering Support for Scholarship and Creative Activities **(handout)**
- g. Administering SOCIs **(handout)**
- h. GE Breadth and taskforce composition **(handout)** HOLD *waiting for CSU Academic Senate Chair to come to EC – see minutes 10/1/2023.*
- i. Carry-over from 2021-2022 Annual Report (Possible New Referrals)
 - i. Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR) Constitution; academic integrity for faculty –FAC
 - ii. RES 212234 CSUB Faculty Retention and Tenure Density Priority – (HOLD- *pending action from President*)
- j. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees [AB 927] – EC
- k. Cultural Taxation Award Criteria and Review Committee Structure – BPC and FAC (HOLD- *check with Provost on if award still exists*)
- l. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) - BPC
- m. Investment Divestiture – BPC

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: DEZEMBER LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER, ROOM 409-411

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Minutes
 - a. October 26, 2023 **(handout)**

- b. November 9, 2023 (**handout**) (tabled)
- C. Announcements and Information
 - a. President's Report – L. Zelezny (**Time Certain: 10:10 AM**).
 - b. Elections and Appointments- M. Danforth
- D. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**).
- E. Reports
 - a. Provost's Report – V. Harper
 - b. ASCSU Report
 - c. Committee Reports: (*Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC posted on the Academic Senate webpage; Senate Log attached*)
 - i. ASI Report- D. Alamillo
 - ii. Executive Committee- M. Danforth
 - iii. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) - D. Solano (**handout**)
 - iv. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS) - E. Correa (**handout**)
 - v. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) - D. Wu (**handout**)
 - vi. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) - M. Rush (**handout**)
 - vii. Staff Report- J. Cornelison
- F. Resolutions (**Time Certain: 10:45 AM**)
 - a. Consent Agenda
 - i. No items.
 - b. New Business
 - i. RES 232410 Doctor of Nursing Practice- AAC and BPC (*tentative*)
 - c. Old Business
 - i. RES 232411 Academic Master Plan – AAC and BPC (**handout-docx pdf**)
 - ii. RES 232412 Evaluation of Academic Administrators – FAC (**handout-docx pdf**)
 - iii. RES 232413 Academic Calendar – BPC (**handout-docx pdf**)
 - iv. RES 232407 Pilot of Interfolio – FAC and EC (**handout-docx pdf**) (*tentative*)
 - v. RES 232401 Statement on Campus Modality – EC (**handout-docx pdf**) (*tentative*)
- G. Open Forum (**Time Certain: 11:15 AM**)
- H. Faculty Recognition (**Time Certain: 11:25 AM**)
- I. Adjournment

8. ADJOURNMENT

Academic Affairs-Budget Advisory Task Force (AA-BAT)

Rv. 11-9-2023

Overview

Over the course of the institution's history the university's budget has consistently expanded with brief periods of reduction. During each reduction period, the university will always protect its core activities of teaching, scholarship, and service. As was described in the November Budget Forum, the university's overall resources face a significant decline. To address this reduction, an Academic Affairs Budget Task Force will be formed to recommend tactics that protect the university's core activities.

Charge

The AA-BAT will begin meeting once populated recommend budgetary adjustments that can be deployed in the current fiscal year including the capture of current open positions (including management), reductions in operating and other resources. The Task Force will have access to data within Academic Affairs.

Limitations

- AA-BAT will only provide recommendations for Academic Affairs
- Curriculum, department and/or program structure cannot be addressed by the AA-BAT

Composition

- Co-Chaired by both an administrator appointed by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate
- One member of the Academic Senate
- One Department Chair
- One School Dean
- CFA President
- Academic Affairs Budget Analyst and University Budget Officer
- A staff member appointed by the Provost

Timeline

- The Task Force should begin its work immediately upon formation with recommendations expected before the start of the Spring term.
- All faculty will receive Winter stipends for work performed over the break

From: [Claudia Catota](#)
To: [Senate Executive Committee Group](#)
Cc: [Vernon Harper](#)
Subject: Great Colleges to Work For Survey Data
Date: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 2:33:31 PM
Attachments: [Copy of 2021 CSUB Faculty Experience Spreadsheet \(version 1\) 9-15-2022.xlsx](#)

Good afternoon, Senate Exec,

Attached is the *Great Colleges to Work For* survey data. In addition, the presentations are available on our website. <https://www.csub.edu/equity-inclusion-compliance/great-colleges-work-survey>

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Best regards,
Claudia

CLAUDIA CATOTA, J.D., M.A.

She/her/ella ([why pronouns matter](#))

Chief Diversity Officer & Special Assistant to the President
Division of Equity, Inclusion, & Compliance (Office of the President)
(661) 654-2137

[SCHEDULE A MEETING](#)

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311

<https://www.csub.edu/equity-inclusion-compliance>

From: [Aaron Hegde](#)
To: [Debra Jackson](#)
Cc: [Vernon Harper](#); [Todd McBride](#); [Jane Dong](#); [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: Re: New Department Proposal - Public Health
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:32:02 PM

Thank you, Dr. Jackson.

We will put this on the EC agenda for tomorrow and if are able to get to it, will send it to standing committees.

Aaron

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD

Chair, Academic Senate
Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Executive Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: BDC 20
Bakersfield, CA 93311

shegde@csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: Debra Jackson <djackson9@csub.edu>
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 at 9:05 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>, Todd McBride <tmcbride@csub.edu>, Jane Dong <jdong2@csub.edu>
Subject: New Department Proposal - Public Health

Dear Dr. Hegde,

A team of faculty from the Public Health, Kinesiology, and Biology programs have proposed a new department, the Department of Public Health, to be housed within the School of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering. This proposal is supported by Jane Dong, Dean of NSME, and Vernon Harper, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The documents can be found at <https://csub.box.com/s/kibjg6yje7juuxm0dw3rscp3rwxhvvv4>.

With Dr. Harper's consent on November 19, 2023, I send these documents for Academic Senate review and approval.

Thank you,
Debra

DEBRA L. JACKSON, Ph.D.

She/her/hers

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dean of Academic Programs

Accreditation Liaison Officer

(661) 654-3420

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 22 EDUC

Bakersfield, CA 93311

<http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms>



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

Statements of Interest for Budget and Planning Committee

Call for: One (1) NSME faculty member to replace Charles Lam on BPC through May 2024

Anthony Bianchi, Ph.D. – Associate Professor, CEE/CS

Statement of Interest:

I would like to apply for the open position on the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC). I am an associate professor in the Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering & Computer Science. Currently, I am serving as the chair of curriculum committee for NSME and have served on the committee for almost four years. My time on curriculum committee has shown me the importance of having faculty involve in planning across departments. Further, it has made me interested in planning at a campus level to help improve the university experience for the students. I would love the chance to start my campus wide committee work on this committee.

Jesse Bergkamp, Ph.D. – Associate Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry

Statement of Interest:

I'm interested in learning more about the Academic Senate and sub-committees as I have not yet had the experience on serving at that level. I have served on many school wide committees and have found them to be of interest. I would like to expand to a campus level. Being a member of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry gives me perspective on laboratory courses and service courses which I feel could help the committee with planning time-blocks.

David Gove, Ph.D. – Professor, Mathematics

Statement of Interest:

I am interested in replacing Charles Lam on BPC.

Topic: Current SOCI Software Replacement using Class Climate

From: [Aaron Hegde](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: SOCI Replacement using Class Climate discussion
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:48:32 PM
Attachments: [Paper SOCI risks93.docx](#)

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD

Chair, Academic Senate
Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Executive Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: BDC 20
Bakersfield, CA 93311

shegde@csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: Deborah Boschini <dboschini@csub.edu>
Date: Monday, May 15, 2023 at 1:17 PM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Subject: FW: SOCI Replacement using Class Climate discussion

Aaron,

Brian provided a summary of a recent conversation that I had with him and Steve Miller. They are proposing using different software to create/process paper SOCI, and it sounds like a reasonable plan to consider.

I'm not sure what level of engagement the Senate would expect with this proposal. The plan would solve some issues while only creating minor changes in the faculty experience. However, the changes that seem minor really do need to be reviewed by the faculty.

Let me know how you'd like to proceed.

Best,
Debbie

DEBORAH J. BOSCHINI, EdD, MSN, RN

she / her / hers

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs

Professor of Nursing

(661) 654-2154

From: Brian Chen <bchen@csub.edu>

Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2023 11:42 AM

To: Deborah Boschini <dboschini@csub.edu>

Cc: Steve Miller <smiller@csub.edu>; Faust Gorham <fgorham@csub.edu>

Subject: SOCI Replacement using Class Climate discussion

Hello Debbie,

Attached is a document Steve drafted to provide a summary of what we discussed. I hope it could be helpful for discussions with the senate.

Thank you.

--

Brian Chen

Director, Enterprise Applications

Information Technology Services

California State University, Bakersfield

<https://www.csub.edu/its/>

<https://twitter.com/itscsub>

Phone: 661-654-2538

Executive Summary

The Paper SOCI processing has two points of failure that are not easily remediated. Failure at either of these points would significantly delay SOCI processing and could impact faculty RPT procedures. The technology used is out of date and has limited functionalities. Class Climate, a product CSUB already licensed, can replace the current system with a new form that is a facsimile of the current form and is equivalent in every functional way. In addition to alleviating the current risks, Class Climate provides several advantages, including the ability to use pens on the forms as well as eliminate the need for paper forms to be scanned by the Print Shop.

Problem

The current state of paper Student Opinionnaire of Course and Instruction (SOCi) processing at CSU Bakersfield has a number of risks. Software for scanning and reporting are outdated and needs replacement to work on modern computers. Scanning hardware is out of date, problematic in scanning, and is limited to only pencils being used.

Failure of the computer that runs the scanning software would negatively impact the timeline for survey processing. The computer is currently running an outdated Operation System and has been removed from the network for security reasons. A replacement machine would be difficult to find as more modern computers no longer has the required hardware to communicate with the legacy scanner. Successful installation of the scanning software on a newer machine, if one were to be found, is not certain.

The current reporting software was created to generate reports that were facsimiles of reports created using the VAX system. Compared to the reports generated by Class Climate for online surveys, the older reports provide less detail. The reporting software is written in PERL, which is a scripting language and not a true programming language that can produce standalone executables, making portability problematic.

Proposed Solution

Class Climate, the current tool for administering online surveys, provides a solution to these issues, and CSUB already has a license to use all the tools necessary. The only additional cost requirement is the purchase of a compatible scanner(s).

A new paper survey could be produced to emulate the current survey. The questions would be the same, the ranking scale in the same order, and the comment prompts identical. Unfortunately, this would render the stock of current SOCI forms unusable, and the campus would have to purchase new forms created in Class Climate.

Benefits

The Class Climate solution, in addition to answering all the risks with current system, has additional advantages:

1. Multiple scan stations could be utilized, thereby speeding up processing.

2. Surveys can use pens as well as pencils.
3. Eliminates the need for students to accurately identify the course they are reviewing. This also eliminates manual data checking currently required.
4. Electronic reports contain not only the quantitative analysis, but the comments are captured as well, eliminating the need for the paper surveys to be scanned into electronic format after the fact.
5. Electronic reports can be delivered to school, department and faculty at the same time.

TOPIC: Consideration for Support for Scholarship and Creative Activities

From: Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csub.edu>

Sent: Monday, October 23, 2023 7:07:31 PM

To: Aaron Hegde <shegade@csub.edu>

Subject: Considering Support for Scholarship and Creative Activities

Dear Chair Hegde,

I hope this message finds you well. I have recently been contacted, independently, by several faculty on this issue in my capacity as Faculty Rights Representative.

I am writing to request that the Academic Senate consider the allocation of support for scholarship and creative activities at our university. Specifically, I would like to address the issue of Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) and how they are allocated for (direct and indirect) instructional activities but not for scholarship, despite the expectation that faculty engage in scholarship and creative activities for retention, tenure, and promotion. WTUs are defined on page 2 of the attached.

This discrepancy in the allocation of WTUs poses a significant challenge to faculty members who are expected to balance their teaching responsibilities with their scholarly and creative pursuits.

Furthermore, if I correctly understand, the support for scholarship and creative activities varies significantly between different schools within the university. While some schools offer release time to faculty to focus on their research and creative work, others do not provide such opportunities. This inconsistency creates disparities in workload and workload equity and places an undue burden on faculty members in schools without access to release time for scholarship.

The impact of this issue is particularly concerning given the diverse demands of scholarship and creative activity across different schools and departments. Faculty members in various fields have distinct needs and expectations when it comes to their scholarly work. Failing to address these differences in workload allocation and support for scholarship can hinder the overall academic productivity of our institution and create an environment where faculty members feel unduly stressed and unsupported.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Zack

ZACHARY ZENKO, PH.D., FACSM, PAPHS

He/Him/His

Associate Professor

Graduate Program Director, [MS in Kinesiology](#)

Department of Kinesiology
(661) 654-2799
Office: EDUC 149
[Zoom Link](#)

Fall 2023 Office Hours

Mondays and Wednesdays: 2:30 pm to 3:45 pm
Thursdays: 1:15 pm to 3:45 pm
By appointment

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 22
Bakersfield, CA 93311

[Essentials of Exercise and Sport Psychology: An Open Access Textbook](#)



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

I am a proud member of the California Faculty Association; if you are not already a proud member of CFA, [join here](#).

Attachment: epr_76-36

EP&R 76-36

**Faculty Workload:
Policies and
Procedures**

Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures

The President of each campus is responsible for the overall conduct of the campus' educational program including the utilization of budgeted instructional faculty positions and the proper assignment of individual faculty workloads.

Variations in campus curricula require variations in the use of instructional faculty positions allocated to each campus. There is, nevertheless, need for a common frame of reference for faculty workload assignments. The intent of the document is to stipulate those policies and procedures which are to be common guides to each President in determining how best to use instructional positions to operate academic programs most effectively.

1. Definition of Faculty Workload *

The normal workload of a full-time faculty member consists of two components:

A. 12 weighted teaching units (WTU) of direct instructional assignments, including classroom and laboratory instruction and instructional supervision (such as student thesis, project or intern supervision) equivalent to 36 hours per week, and

B. 3 WTU equivalences of indirect instructional activity such as student advisement, curriculum development and improvements, and committee assignments (4 to 9 hours per week).

Thus Weighted Teaching Units are a measure of the weekly rate of faculty effort.

* Faculty belong to workweek group 4D7 as defined in the California State University and Colleges Sal Schedule (issued annually).

11. Assignment of Faculty Workloads

A. Legislative Restrictions

Recent budget language requires "...that no instructional faculty positions ... shall be used for administration, department chairmanships, administrative assistance or non-instructional research."

Funds budgeted for instructional positions are therefore prohibited from being used or disencumbered for support of

1. the budgeted function of the Institutional Support Program;
2. administrative functions at the campus, school or division level of organization;
3. department chairperson or comparable positions or duties; or
4. positions or duties related to noninstructional research.

In order that we may be prepared to respond appropriately to any questions raised in management audits, if the President has any doubts regarding the propriety of a particular assignment in terms of the legislative mandate or Trustee policy, he or she may submit the case to the Chancellor's Office for review.

B. System Policy

1. Each campus shall meet its budgeted FTES (full time equivalent students) with its budgeted faculty allocation within the following limits-

150 FTES (campus size 10,000 FTES or less)

200 FTES (campus size over 10,000 FTES)

2. Assignment of individual faculty to direct instructional activities should be made in accordance with the Faculty Workload Formula in Appendix A. This Workload Formula is the basis for

calculating the faculty workload reported in the Academic Planning Data Base.

It is intended that the workload formula should not, in and of itself, serve as a basis for significant deviations from historic campus class size experience; a flexible approach to class size by the campus is encourage where it is consistent with the optimal use of faculty skills and is not detrimental to the quality of instructional programs.

3. In special cases, approved by the President (or a designated Vice President,) a faculty member may be assigned up to three WTU (four WTU for for individuals whose course assignments would each normally generate four WTU) for an exceptionally heavy indirect instructional activity. Such assignments are primarily possible because of the assignment of 15 WTU of direct instructional activity per faculty position used for part-time appointments and the related unavailability of part-time faculty to perform the indirect instructional activity. However, assignments for legitimate non-administrative instructional support functions may also be authorized in addition to that derived from the averaging-in of part-time faculty workloads.

More than four WTU may be assigned to an individual faculty member for indirect instructional activities if in the judgment of the President such an assignment is necessary for the effective conduct of the academic program. Individual exceptions may be granted only through direct application to the President of each campus.

a. Such assignments are no to be used in such a way as to cause widespread of across-the-board deviation from or reduction of normal instructional workloads.

b. Assigned WTU should no be provided to individuals where such an assignment results in a workload in excess of 12 WTU. Exceptions to this provision must be individually approved by the President (or a designated Vice President). All such assignments should be reported.

c, Records of all WTU assignments for indirect instructional activities are subject to review and audit and should include:

1. a description of the specific task(s) to be performed and the number of WTU assigned;
2. formal approval of the assignment; and
3. an after-the-fact evaluation of the assignment.

d. Each campus must prepare an annual report summarizing its use of assigned WTU during the previous fiscal year. Such a report should include a summary of assigned WTU by academic department and purpose of assignment and will serve as the basis for campus administrative review of assigned WTU activities.

e. Unusually heavy responsibility in any of the indirect instructional activities listed in Appendix B may serve as the basis for these workload adjustments which take the form of assigned WTU in lieu of WTU generated through direct instructional activity. All such assignments should be reported in the Academic Planning Data Base.

4. Variations in course credit hours and workload formula factors make it impossible always to schedule faculty members for exactly 12 WTU of direct instruction each term; however, the workloads during the semesters or quarters should be balanced, so that faculty members are responsible for a full workload on an annual average basis. Where made necessary by calendar considerations, and in rare instances only, such adjustments may be made between one fiscal year and the next if a faculty member has not been present for the full preceding academic year.

APPENDIX A

The California State University and Colleges Faculty Workload Formula

Classes meeting 1 hour for 1 unit of credit - - K factor: 1

C-1	Large lecture	Unlimited except by physical facilities or scheduling necessities.
C-2	Lecture-Discussion, including methods	normal limit 40
C-3	Lecture-Composition Lecture-Counseling Law-Case Study	normal limit 30
C-4	Composition Accounting Mathematics Mathematical Statistics, Logic, and Philosophy; Business Math and English Science Math Music (Harmony, Theory, Composition, Counterpoint, Orchestration, Instrumentation, Conducting, Form and Analysis, Sight Singing) Speech: Public and Correction Foreign Language (including literature and culture courses taught in the foreign language) Engineering Lecture Problems Linguistics	normal limit 25
C-5	Undergraduate Seminars Graduate Discussion Honors and Graduate Seminars	normal limit 20 normal limit 15
C-6	Clinical Processes Education (Testing) Nursing Psychology Driver Training in simulator	Lower Division -- normal limit 20 Upper Division -- normal limit 10 Grad. Division -- normal limit 10 (or physical facilities in all divisions)

Classes meeting 2 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor: 1.3

C-7 Art, Anthropology, Science activities	normal limit 24 or physical facilities
C-8 Education Workshops (includes methods taught on an activity basis in education and subject areas) Social Science activity Science demonstration	normal limit 30
C-9 Music activity - large group	normal limit 40
C-10 Instrumental or vocal instruction	normal limit 10
C-11 Physical Education and Recreation activity	normal limit 30, (or physical facilities)
C-12 Speech, Drama, and Journalism activities	normal limit 20
C-13 Business and Accounting Labs Geography Foreign Language Home Economics Psychology Library Science Photography Engineering Industrial Arts Agriculture Mathematics Statistics	normal limit, physical facilities or scheduling necessities
C-14 Remedial Instruction: EOP courses only: Mathematics Reading Speech Writing	normal limit 15

Classes meeting 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor: 1.5

C-15 Laboratories in Art

- Foreign Language
- English (as a foreign language)
- Home Economics
- Industrial Arts
- Kinesiology
- Speech Correction
- Cartography
- Audio-Visual
- Mathematics
- Library Science
- Police Science)

normal limit: physical Facilities

Classes meeting 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor 2.0

C-16 Laboratories in Science

- Agriculture
- Engineering/Meteorology
- Psychology
- Natural Resources
- Photograph

normal limit: physical facilities, generally 24;
allowable range 8-24 based upon learning situation, hazard to
health and equipment, and availability of equipment

C-17 Demonstration-Laboratory, for
clinical practice in off-campus
facilities:

normal limit 8

Classes meeting more than 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor 6.0

C-18 Coaching major intercollegiate sports

- (Not more than four per year for women)
- (Not more than four per year for men)
- (The sum including coeducational sports no to exceed eight per year)

normal limit 20

Classes meeting more than 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor 3.0

C-19 Coaching minor intercollegiate sports

normal limit 20

C-20 Production courses or workshops in:

- Art
- Drama
- Journalism
- Music
- Photography
- Radio-TV
- Debate:
(resulting in a major public performance, showing or distribution.)

normal limit 20

C-21 Music -- major performance groups:

- Symphony orchestra
- College band
- College chorus

normal limit 40

S -- Allowance for supervisory staff:

(Only for courses providing individual supervision)

Undergraduate level:

S-25 Supervision of directed teaching
and public school nursing

ratio: 1:25

S-36 Supervision of field work
Driver Training in car off campus
Work Study
Project Supervision

ratio: 1:36

S-48 Music - Studio instruction (majors only)

ratio: 1:48

Graduate level:

S-25 Supervision of directed teaching
and public school nursing
Supervision of field work
Work study
Theses and projects

ratio: 1:25

S-12 * MSW Field Courses

ratio 1:12

APPENDIX B

Activities for which Weighted Teaching Units may be assigned.

This is the code used for reporting assigned WTU in the Academic Planning Data Base

11. Excess Enrollments

- a. For classes with census date enrollment of between 75 and 120 exceptional workload, a graduate assistant or student assistant may be allocated.
- b. For classes with census date enrollment of over 120, a graduate assistant, a student assistant, or and additional 3 WTU may be assigned.

Assignment of graduate assistants is a preferable way of handling such large class loads, but it is recognized that qualified graduate assistants are not always available.

In no case shall a faculty member be granted assigned WTU for more than one class with excess enrollments.

12. New Preparations

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for preparation of courses never before taught by that particular faculty member, if courses actually taught include two or more such new preparations.

14. Course or Supervision Overload

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU equal to course of supervision overload earned in a prior fiscal year provided that calendar considerations so necessitate and the faculty member has not been present for the full preceding academic year.

18. Instructional Support for Graduate Students

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special graduate student testing duties, in particular for conducting comprehensive examinations for master's degree candidates and examinations in fulfillment of foreign language requirements.

21. Special Instructional Programs

- a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation in a team teaching effort. The total assigned and earned WTU associated with a team-taught course may not exceed the WTU generated by the course multiplied by the number of faculty members teaching the course. In addition, no individual faculty member may be given more WTU, both earned and assigned than the course generates.
- b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for program and tape production for instructional television.
- c. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for liaison duties among multiple sections of the same course.
- d. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for the administration and evaluation of tests for credit by examination.

22. Instructional Experimentation, Innovation, or Instructionally Related Research

- a. A faculty member may be given assigned time for development and implementation of experimental programs involving:
 1. Instructional television
 2. Computer assisted instruction
 3. Other innovations in instruction
- b. A faculty member may be given assigned time for documented research evaluations which are demonstrably related to the instructional functions and programs of the college.

23. Instruction Related Services

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for his services related to college clinics, study skill centers, farms, art galleries, and other campus institutions and facilities which are ancillary to the instructional program.

31 Advising Responsibilities

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying an excessive advising load due to a relatively high proportion of part-time faculty in his department.

b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying a greater than normal share of departmental or school advising responsibilities.

c. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for services as departmental graduate advisor.

32. Instruction-Related Committee Assignments

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation over and above normal levels in such areas as curriculum, personnel, budget, library, audiovisual, and selection committees at the department, school or college level.

b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for membership in or liaison to special committees whose activities have significant bearing on the instructional programs of the college, or the CSUC system at large.

33. Curricular Planning or Studies

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special individual or committee-related curriculum planning, development and redevelopment activities.

b. A faculty member may be give assigned WTU for development of special tests for credit by examination.

34. Accreditation Responsibilities

A faculty member may be give assigned WTU for accreditation responsibilities.

3 5. Instruction-Related Facilities Planning

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for duties related to planning of instructional facilities.

Memorandum of Understanding

The California State University and the California Faculty Association agree that in the calculation of faculty workload, the following definitions shall be used in describing instruction involving one-on-one contact between faculty and student.

S-Factor Definitions

S-Factor courses are assigned when the mode of instruction involves direct one-on-one contact between faculty and student. The average amount of faculty time per student referenced in the definitions includes faculty preparation, evaluation, travel, and liaison with agencies when necessary.

S-1. This category maybe used for any supervision that requires of the instructor * an average of three-quarters of one hour per week of activity with each individual supervised student. The faculty member would receive one-third WTU for each student.

S-2. This category may be used for any supervision that requires of the instructor an average of one hour per week of activity with each individual supervised student. The faculty member would receive one-third WTU for each student.

S-3. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in requiring of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of on and one-half hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with school or agency personnel. The faculty member would receive one-half WTU for each student.

S-4. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in which the instructor assumes direct responsibility for the activities of the student, and that requires of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of two hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with agency personnel. The faculty member would receive two-thirds WTU for each student.

S-5. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in which the instructor assumes direct responsibility for the activities of the student, and that requires of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of three hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with agency personnel. The faculty member would receive one WTU for each student.

Supervision Courses --Amend. to EP&R 76-36

You are aware that the current contract between the CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA) provides for a joint CSU/CFA Workload Committee to, inter alia, review and recommend revisions and clarifications to existing workload formulae. This committee has reviewed the existing supervision (S factor) course classification and recommended that revised definitions which are discipline independent be provided for existing supervision categories, and that a new category S-4 (equivalent to S-18 in the previous nomenclature) be created. These recommendations have been reviewed by the Management Advisory Group and, subsequently, by all campus presidents. A memorandum of understanding involving these revisions has been signed by the CSU and CFA (see attachment).

These new supervision course classifications are available for use by the campuses beginning with the Summer 1992 term. The new definitions and numbers make no changes in workload for the categories. They do, as indicated above, add a new category (S-4) for which eighteen supervised students constitutes a full workload. The new definitions attempt to clarify the connection between the workload measured in WTU and the amount of time spent with each student in the course of the supervised activity. Please note that the existing supervision course categories have been renumbered as S-1 through S-5 (corresponding to S-48, S-36, S-25, S-18, and S-12, respectively).

The new category and the revised numbers should be used for faculty workload reporting beginning with Summer quarter, 1992.

From: [Aaron Hegde](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: Academic Senate Considerations of SOCI process and timelines
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:43:29 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-lqf0ffdq.png](#)

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD

Chair, Academic Senate
Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Executive Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: BDC 20
Bakersfield, CA 93311

shegde@csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csub.edu>
Date: Thursday, November 16, 2023 at 9:29 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>, Maureen Rush <mrush@csub.edu>
Subject: Academic Senate Considerations of SOCI process and timelines

Dear Chairs Hegde and Rush,

I am emailing you with a topic to consider for referral.

As we engage in ongoing conversations regarding the efficacy and fairness of student evaluations, I would like to propose some considerations.

The subject of student evaluations of courses bears inherent biases that have been well-documented in numerous studies. These biases challenge the reliability and fairness of such evaluations in accurately assessing teaching effectiveness.

I mentioned in the previous senate meeting that the typical time for paper-based SOCI is one week, and in fact one class period. In contrast, the online SOCI have more than

one month for data collection. This is, of course, extremely different and inequitable. I also worry that this causes additional bias.

Allowing a month for evaluations introduces numerous variables that could significantly influence the feedback received, including final grades on major projects or exams, potentially skewing the results. Moreover, the nearly undeniable correlation between grades and student evaluation scores emphasizes the need to understand this relationship more thoroughly to prevent faculty members from being unfairly penalized for maintaining academic rigor (although I like to believe that one can be rigorous and achieve excellent SOCIs).

Specifically, I suggest considering:

1. Shortening the time frame for students to submit evaluations to minimize the impact of external factors such as final grades on their feedback. If paper-based SOCIs are available to students for one class meeting, then I think it is reasonable that online SOCIs are available for one or two weeks (not a month).
2. Encouraging the provision of summary correlations between grades and student evaluation scores to aid in distinguishing between rigor and ease within courses - or at least recognize this as a confounding variable. To facilitate this, students would need to submit their student IDs with their evaluation. Same for the next suggestion.
3. Developing a system to identify and flag biased, discriminatory, or prejudiced responses within evaluations and exploring the feasibility of automatically excluding students with multiple occurrences of such responses across multiple courses from the summary scores. I believe this has already been implemented in other institutions. Currently, the online SOCIs do not allow the linkage between quantitative scores and qualitative comments. If a student makes a discriminatory comment, then their quantitative evaluation cannot be automatically or manually addressed.

In my opinion, the Academic Senate must ensure the fairness and reliability of our student evaluation process. This approach aligns with our commitment to teaching excellence and the integrity of our educational standards.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this proposal.

Warm regards,

ZACHARY ZENKO, PH.D., FACSM, PAPHS

He/Him/His

Associate Professor

Graduate Program Director, [MS in Kinesiology](#)

Department of Kinesiology

(661) 654-2799

Office: EDUC 149

[Zoom Link](#)

Fall 2023 Office Hours

Mondays and Wednesdays: 2:30 pm to 3:45 pm

Thursdays: 1:15 pm to 3:45 pm

By appointment

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 22

Bakersfield, CA 93311

Essentials of Exercise and Sport Psychology: An Open Access Textbook



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

I am a proud member of the California Faculty Association; if you are not already a proud member of CFA, [join here](#).

Handout: GE Breadth and Task force Composition

From: [Beth Bywaters](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: Request to prepare for GE changes
Date: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 10:39:32 AM

From: Debra Jackson <djackson9@csub.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 9:39 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>; Beth Bywaters <ebywaters@csub.edu>
Subject: Request to prepare for GE changes

Dear Aaron,

I would like to request that the Academic Senate form a work group to plan for expected changes to our GE Breadth.

State Assembly Bill 928 (AB 928) calls for the establishment of a “singular lower-division general education pathway” that meets the academic requirements necessary for transfer admission from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to both UC and the California State University (CSU). AB 928 also limits the number of units in the pathway to a 34-unit ceiling. This new lower-division general education pathway goes into effect fall 2025.

While we do not yet have details about how the CSU will adjust our GE Breadth requirements in response to Cal-GETC, I do expect that there will be changes. If not, the lower division requirements for native CSU students will be different from those for transfer students, which creates a troubling inconsistency. Currently, CSU’s Breadth is 39 units, whereas Cal-GETC is 34 units. Cal-GETC has 3 units fewer in lower-division Area C, does not have the 3-unit Area E, and has one unit for B3.

Given that Cal-GETC goes into effect in fall 2025, I believe it behooves us to develop a plan to adopt these changes to the GE curriculum in the likely event that they are adopted across the CSU. Any changes to our GE curriculum would require full senate approval. To prepare for a fall 2025 implementation, we would need to have this in place by early fall 2024 for catalog deadlines.

Thank you for your consideration,
Debra

DEBRA L. JACKSON, Ph.D.
She/her/hers
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dean of Academic Programs
(661) 654-3420

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 22 EDUC
Bakersfield, CA 93311