



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Academic Senate
Del Norte Hall 1500
February 4th, 2014
2:30pm-4:30pm
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Virgil Adams III, Mary Adler, Sean Anderson, Julia Balén, Frank Barajas, A.J. Bieszczad, Karen Carey, Stephen Clark, Matt Cook, Beatrice de Oca, Nancy Deans, Colleen Delaney, Jesse Elliott, Marie Francois, Jeanne Grier, John Griffin, Ivona Grzegorzcyk, Georgina Guzmán, Pauline Hunter, Dax Jacobson, J. Jacob Jenkins, Antonio Jiménez-Jiménez, Jill Leafstedt, Kathryn Leonard, Jason Miller, Luke Matjas, Jim Meriwether, Jason Miller, Paul Murphy, Nitika Parmar, Monica Pereira, Janet Pinkley, Luda Popenhagen, Sofia Samatar, Tom Schmidhauser, Kaia Tollefson, Amy Wallace, Cindy Wyels.

I. Welcome

As of 2:43pm, quorum was not yet met, so it was decided that Senate session would proceed with reports and other non-voting items.

II. Provost's report

Dan Wakelee gave the report on behalf of the Provost. Gave enrollment numbers for Spring and noted that this week is the final week to drop students. Added that census is Friday 2/14 and noted that the campus is looking at more students than usable space. Campus is considering utilizing unused space on the Thousand Oaks campus for a number of upper division sections in majors where there are concentrations in the Conejo Valley including business, psychology, communication, and Sociology. Gave an update on budget process and timeline of divisional budget request, noting that faculty are majority of divisional requests.

III. Report from the Statewide Senators

The Chair read aloud the report from S. Aloisio.

Three resolutions passed: one with recommendations related to nursing preparation students; a resolution calling for the reinstatement of a research, scholarship, and creative activities fund; and a resolution that recommends amending Title 5 to allow for a 132 unit cap for engineering majors. Several resolutions will be second reading items in March including: selecting faculty representatives in shared governance, concerns regarding community college Baccalaureate pilot program, and support of CSU ethnic studies programs. Copies of resolutions can be found at: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/>

Chancellor White reported and answered questions. He reported on the governor's budget and concerns of money tied to 4-year graduation rates. He said the system plans to set aside \$900M



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

over the next three years for deferred maintenance projects. He also talked about funding for 8400 new students across the system, however he emphasized that he expects campuses will support existing “unfunded” students first. There is concern on many campuses about taking more students.

Besides the regular reports, we got a report from the director of QOLT (Quality Online Learning and Teaching), and from the national AAUP (American Association of University Professors).

There is a new ASCSU newsletter available online with contributions from each area of the senate. Chancellor White will contribute to the next issue. It can be found at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Newsletter/index.shtml>

Chair Grier reminded everyone to send your questions to statewide Senators.

D. Wakelee gave an update on the Coursematch program. The CSU is required by law to make Coursematch courses more broadly available starting fall. N. Deans pointed that the Chancellor’s Office has a large list of courses that will need to be offered online. I. Grzegorzcyk asked about the process to register, commenting that a paper form is required. D. Wakelee commented that registration process is still a work in progress.

Point of information: Quorum was met at 2:50pm.

III. Approval of the Agenda

Motion to approve by I. Grzegorzcyk. Motion was seconded. Approved.

IV. Approval of the Minutes of December 3rd, 2013

Motion to approve by I. Grzegorzcyk. Motion seconded by Julia Balén.

V. Report from CFA President

J. Griffin thanked Nancy Deans for covering the CFA Reports last semester and announced that on Monday 2/10, Channel Islands will be hosting Jonathan Carp, one of the CFA statewide representatives and an expert on the CalPERS retirement system in a two-hour workshop on how the retirement system works for CFA members. J. Griffin reminded everyone that the CFA contract expires in June and reported that negotiations have opened and the bargaining team is making good progress. A flyer will be in mailboxes and John asked that everyone post those as a show of support for the efforts of new negotiating team to have a new contract in place come June. Finally, John gave a legislative update on funding and informed everyone that a link has already been sent out on how to email State representatives in order to suggest higher levels of funding for the CSU. I. Grzegorzcyk asked if the letter is editable, and John reported that they indeed are editable.

VI. Report from the Senate Chair



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Chair Grier started off with sending around a thank-you card for Kathy Musashi, who is retiring on 2/7. Chair also reminded everyone of Kathy's quilt show on opening on Thursday 2/6 from 4:30pm-6:30pm in Broome Library Gallery.

The Chair also gave an updating regarding actions being taken as a response to hate events at San Jose State University. The campus has asked other campuses to show their support by creating resolutions against hate and hate crime activity. Our campus, together with Dr. Sawyer and Student Affairs are creating a "Don't Hate, Elevate" task force. There will be activities all semester long created with student input, including a pro-active sit-in. Contact Chair Grier if you are interested in being on a task force working on a Senate resolution.

Next, Chair Grier updated those present regarding the call for volunteers for the CI Athletics Planning Committee. Volunteer Debi Hoffman was chosen, and Donald Rodriguez is the other faculty member currently on that Committee. Chair has also put in a divisional budget request for Academic Senate which included Senate officers reassigned time, summer and other stipends, and enhanced staff support, noting that Standing Senate Committee chairs get some reassigned time and Senate Executive Committee officers get reassigned time on other campuses.

Finally, the Chair announced that the Senate newsletter is in progress and should launch soon. Please send announcements and survey information to the Chair so that they may appear as a link in newsletter. Also, per request from Communication and Marketing, Chair Grier announced the Corporate Games in order to promote participation by faculty. Corporate Games take place from 4/2-5-10 and there is more information and a [link to the Corporate Games Website](#) in the [February 13th issue of Wavelength](#). Everyone is encouraged to look at the varied list of activities and participate.

VII. Intent to Raise Questions

1. J. Meriwether:

Background: Question was prompted by Chancellor White's State of the CSU address and the stated Chancellor's Office priority of increasing hiring of tenure track faculty in order to help students achieve their degrees. (see attachment- displaying table of ratio of tenure track to lecturer faculty in the CSU as well as PDF of Little Hoover Commission study).
To begin to reverse the long-declining ratio of tenure track to lecturer faculty:

Question:

1) Using the same methodology as the Little Hoover Commission document, could we have an updated snapshot (for Fall 2013 as opposed to October 2012) to see where we are now?

2) Two years ago, Senate passed a resolution ([SP 11-06](#)) to improve tenure track to lecturer faculty ratio. Could that hiring plan be updated so that we have a vision now of how we might



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

improve our ratio? Jesse Elliot asked about methodology. Footnote at bottom of document notates methodology.

1a) A.J. Bieszczad amended the question to indicate a desire for the results to be publicized. J. Meriwether accepted this as a friendly amendment.

(See attachments, Little Hoover Commission document and Faculty Ratios)

2) K. Leonard:

Background: The Math department has a faculty position out for search this Spring semester. There are 200 applicants and a very short timeline for reviewing 3-4 candidates. Candidate review packets are often in varying order and somewhat incomplete. Packet has an application, a cover letter, a CV, and a teaching statement- but no research statement or letters of recommendation.

Question: What do we need to do in order to get well-organized candidate file packets that include the full range of information needed in the hiring process?

I. Grzegorzczuk amended the question to thank Search Committee and commend that Committee on the high quality of questions contained in the application. Friendly amendment.

VIII. Second Reading Items

- SP 13-06 Policy on Academic Dishonesty

C. Wyels introduced this item, adding that SAPP offers some slight revisions based on Senate first reading comments. Item was opened for discussion.

J. Elliott questioned why the policy specifically applies “in degree credit courses” versus “all students”. C. Wyels commented that the policy was broadened to include Extended Ed students, and other students including non-stateside and non-credit. V. Adams said this policy should apply to everyone. Discussion. A.J. Bieszczad mentioned transfer students. C. Wyels noted that non-credit students taking CEU courses (such as OSHER and OLLI) are only ones that are excluded with current wording. S. Anderson mentioned that OSHER attendees don’t get letter grades. J. Elliott motioned to strike the language “in degree credit courses”. Motion was seconded by V. Adams.

K. Leonard asked if there is a campus definition of degree credit courses that could be placed as a footnote. J. Elliott made a point about course articulation to other colleges. C. Wyels called question. Motion was seconded by M. Cook.

Motion to strike “in degree credit courses”.

J. Grier asked for objections to show of hands. Seeing none, vote was taken by show of hands.



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Approve:24
Oppose: 8
Abstain:4

Motion passes. Amendment carries.

Vote taken to approve There were no objections to a vote by a show of hands.

Approve: 36
Oppose: 0
Abstain: 0

Policy passes.

IX. First Reading Items

- SP 13-07 MA in Psychology - Short Form

Motion to discuss by A.J. Bieszczad. Motion was seconded by V. Adams. V. Adams introduced the policy. General idea is to have a small program of two tracks- applied and doctoral, and noted that Ventura County does not have another Master's Program at a public University. Degree would serve the 75-100 students a year graduate in Psychology and intent is to be a stateside program similar in structure to current English M.A..

A. Jiménez-Jiménez asked about student objectives: would this program entail the use of teaching assistants (TA's) and how will that affect the running of this program? V. Adams said CI students would serve as TA's, which would build their skillsets; describing as the program is small, that using teaching assistants won't have a huge impact on student/faculty ratio.

M. Pereira inquired as to number of M.A. candidates. B. de Oca responded that there are expected to be about ten candidates in the first year, with twelve for the following year, assuming some attrition. A. Jiménez-Jiménez asked about budget and number of professors- would faculty only teach for Master's program? V. Adams replied that the hope is to grow number of TT faculty in whole Psychology program and the MA program intends on faculty from programs to serve on thesis and other Committees.

J. Leafstedt asked regarding implications of Senate passing short form. Does this put us on a timeline for hiring? Extended discussion of implications of placing programs on Academic Master Plan (AMP) , and the implementation and timing of placing programs on the AMP, as well as implications of and differences between Short and Long Forms.

Continued discussion of timing and priorities, impacted programs, new programs and size of programs vis à vis number of students benefited by a program. Point of information: A. Wallace reminded everyone that a short form decision does not tie anything to timing or funding. Further animated discussion of Academic Master Plans and short forms. It was noted that some programs have remained on the AMP for as long as 10 years. K. Tollefson voiced her support of approving short forms for graduate programs in order to ensure things are in place when future opportunity arises.

K. Leonard pointed out that timing of items on the AMP are not clear and that there is currently no explicit policy once a program goes on AMP. M. Cook noted that Academic Planning has complete control over AMP; no control over when something on plan is implemented. Discussion. J. Elliott and I. Grzegorzcyk spoke in support of Master's programs in general and elaborated on benefits, such as no need to hire faculty, the attracting grants and other resources to programs, and the use of TA's leading to salary savings and possibly research. I. Grzegorzcyk noted previous success of small Master's programs on top of large undergrad programs.

Discussion of why program was not run through Extended Ed, including self-support cycles being too low. V. Adams responded that, after conversations with faculty, it was determined that the program will best be run stateside, and that the nature of program would be difficult to run on an accelerated Extended University timeline/calendar. B. de Oca also commented that there will be a lot of one-on-one work with students and intense level of supervision and that faculty cannot do that on top of normal research, so the program is not possible to do through Extended Ed.

J. Balén spoke on tension between new and existing programs, and impacts on number of tenure-track faculty. A. Jiménez-Jiménez spoke on need to prepare for future of the University. Discussion of need for University to offer a complete quality package of offerings, and of countywide choices available to local students. J. Meriwether suggested that there be more clarity on AMP issues before moving on. Chair Grier offered that the conversation will be expanded to a future presentation on the AMP. Chair will help facilitate venue. M. Cook encouraged everyone to read charge for AMP and review potential areas for revamping, noting that Provost Hutchinson is also interested in revamping AMP process. Chair Grier pointed out that fall process of approving the AMP means approving that document to be sent on to the Chancellor's Office. Programs put "wished-for" dates; but what Senate's vote means is a general approbation of the program.

Comments on the Psychology Master's should be forwarded to V. Adams.

- SP 13-08 Minor in Philosophy- Long Form
Motion to introduce by I. Grzegorzcyk. Motion was seconded by J. Balén.



ACADEMIC SENATE

CHANNEL ISLANDS

J. Elliott introduced the policy and both he and J. Balén gave background on process of creating the major and minor. Six courses are cross-listed in order to build on University mission pillars. Program currently listed as being housed in Psychology (subject to change).

K. Leonard commended the team for their work on minor. Minimal discussion. Item will return to next Senate for second reading.

X. Reports from Standing Committees

Curriculum Committee:

M. Cook gave thanks to retiring Kathy Musashi and welcomed Rosa Rodriguez in her new role. Also announced that Jenn Perry is on maternity leave and that the Committee is currently looking for a volunteer to serve in her stead in the Social and Behavior sciences position for the Spring semester.

Professional Leave Committee

J. Elliott announced that the Committee would like to revisit rubric for sabbatical proposals. Give suggestions to Jesse . The PLC plans to meet with the RTP Committee.

XI. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

Minigrant Review Committee

J. Miller reported that 35 minigrant proposals were submitted and that the Committee has an ambitious timeline for review. Congratulated award recipients.

Center for Multicultural Engagement

J. Balén announced a screening of *Valentine Road*, documentary of the local Laurence King murder case. Filmmaker will be present; also a vigil. Events will take place on 2/11 at 5:30 Malibu 100. Flyer will be distributed.

Center for Community Engagement

D. Downey announced that he would like to encourage interest in CCE. There will be awards, as well as fliers and brochures available. Contact Dennis for information on best practices in service learning recognition.

Committee on Centers and Institutes

N. Parmar reported that the Committee work is in progress. The Committee will seek input on centers and send updates on progress.

Center for International Affairs

A. Jiménez announced that the Center for International Affairs is accepting proposals for UNIV 392 for new courses (winter break 2015).



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

XII. Announcements

B. de Oca announced that on Tuesday 2/25, the Psychology club- in partnership with Student Health Services and student housing -- is hosting a movie, dinner, and panel discussion regarding mental health issues and eating disorders. Information will be going out.

ISLAS

M. Francois announced that on Sunday 3/9 from 5:30-7:30 in Malibu Hall ISLAS is hosting a screening of the film *First Generation* in partnership with the Ventura County Women's Forum. Film profiles four students, There will be a follow-up discussion the following Monday 3/10 (at the Ventura County Community Foundation in Camarillo).

RSCA

J. Miller announced that an email will go out in early February. The next "RSCA Business" meeting will be on Monday 2/24 at 6pm in Broome 1670.

K. Tollefson announced that an RFP for SOJU (Conference in Social Justice in Education) will be emailed out. Proposals are due 2/24. Conference takes place 4/19; theme is cultivating mentorship in schools and society. Information will be sent out via Email.

Chair Grier reminded everyone about upcoming Senate newsletter. Any announcement items should be sent to her for inclusion.

XIII. Adjourn:

4:09pm

Figures taken from "CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FROM THE LITTLE
HOOVER COMMISSION"

Appendix 2, p. 10. Document sent to faculty April 24, 2013.

Appendix 2 contains this note about these figures:

"All data are from the Campus Information Retrieval System (CIRS) AN file as of October 31, 2012; CIRS is the user interface for extraction of records from PIMS. Full-time equivalents are obtained by adding up the time base of individuals in each category. Most tenure-track faculty are full time; however, the majority of lecturers hold-part-time positions."

Calculations in last column were added post-CSU report.

Campus	Tenure-track		Total Faculty FTE	% TT of Total
	Faculty FTE	Lecturer FTE		
Bakersfield	180.1	116.2	296.2	60.8%
Channel Islands	85	144.7	229.7	37.0%
Chico	434.3	223.2	657.6	66.0%
Dominguez Hills	195.4	229.3	424.7	46.0%
East Bay	287.5	193.7	481.1	59.8%
Fresno	502.6	343.7	846.3	59.4%
Fullerton	722.1	602.5	1324.6	54.5%
Humboldt	220.3	150.6	370.9	59.4%
Long Beach	768.5	543.6	1312.1	58.6%
Los Angeles	495.5	294	789.6	62.8%
Maritime	45.3	19.2	64.4	70.3%
Monterey Bay	119.9	138.9	258.8	46.3%
Northridge	775.9	507.3	1283.2	60.5%
Pomona	490.5	292.5	783	62.6%
Sacramento	597.5	310.5	908	65.8%
San Bernardino	368.2	244	612.1	60.2%
San Diego	707	323.4	1030.3	68.6%
San Francisco	706.3	407.5	1113.8	63.4%
San Jose	627.8	528	1155.8	54.3%
San Luis Obispo	630.8	255.2	886	71.2%
San Marcos	229	181.7	410.7	55.8%
Sonoma	234.2	114	348.1	67.3%
Stanislaus	232.3	110.5	342.8	67.8%
Total	9655.9	6273.8	15929.7	60.6%

(Campuses with tenure-track/ total faculty ratios of less than 50% are highlighted.)

(CSU Systemwide Average highlighted in purple)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FROM THE LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

Preface

The California State University welcomes the opportunity to respond to a request for information from the Little Hoover Commission regarding CSU faculty and faculty workload. The commission asked for the following information:

1. The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty at CSU's 23 campuses;
2. The average number of classes taught each semester by tenured and tenure-track faculty;
3. The percentage of total classes at CSU taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty;
4. The percentage of total classes at CSU taught by adjuncts, lecturers, and other instructors;
5. The average number of credit hours taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty each year;
6. The average number of lower-division classes taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty versus upper division classes;
7. The average number of professors granted tenure each year;
8. CSU's policy on sabbaticals as detailed in its agreement with the California Faculty Association;
9. The percentage of tenure and tenure-track faculty typically on sabbatical each semester and the percentage of tenured faculty that represents;
10. The average class size for lower-division students vs. average class size for upper-division students;
11. The number of hours tenured or tenure-track faculty spend on average each week on instruction and instruction-related activities and the percentage of undergraduates they teach;
12. Minimum academic workload required for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

In order to place the responses in context, we are providing some background on CSU faculty and how faculty assignments are made.

The work of tenure-track faculty in the CSU falls into three general categories: teaching; research, scholarly, and creative activities; and university, community, and professional service. All of these activities are critical to the CSU's mission.

- **Teaching** is the primary activity of CSU faculty. Our faculty provides instruction in traditional classrooms and, increasingly, in on-line or "hybrid" formats (those combining face-to-face and on-line components). The faculty is at the forefront of efforts to redesign courses to increase access, improve student learning, and incorporate new technologies. Instruction also includes one-on-one work with undergraduate and graduate students on research projects and supervision of students in thesis research, student teaching, field work, community service learning, and other opportunities for learning outside the classroom.
- **Research, scholarly, and creative activities** are integral to the CSU's graduate programs and often are carried out by faculty working side by side with undergraduate and graduate students. Faculty scholarship helps CSU faculty maintain currency and refresh the curriculum. Faculty research activity brings vital resources in the form of grants and contracts into the university; these resources, in turn, allow students to gain experience solving real-world problems and prepare them for success after graduation.

- CSU tenure-track faculty members perform essential **service to the university, community, and profession**. Faculty members build the curriculum, establish academic standards, and participate in shared governance. Senior faculty members rigorously evaluate their peers for tenure and promotion. Faculty members serve as advisors and mentors to students, perform departmental administrative duties, assess the effectiveness of academic programs, and assist with other priorities including accreditation. Many CSU faculty members bring their expertise into the community, often in collaboration with CSU students, and CSU faculty members participate in professional organizations at the regional, national, and international level.

CSU Workload Conventions

In assigning work to faculty members, the CSU uses a system of “weighted teaching units”, or WTU. The intent of the weighting system is to account for the time a faculty member would be expected to spend in the classroom as well as the time spent on course preparation, holding office hours for students, grading, and so forth. One WTU of instruction is expected to equate to about 3 hours of total effort by the faculty member per week. Appendix 1 provides some additional explanation of the weighting system. Weighted teaching units are identical to credit hours earned by students in classes offered in lecture, seminar, and discussion formats, but do *not* match credit hours for laboratory classes, small-group activities, fieldwork, or assignments where the faculty member works one-on-one with a student (“supervision classes”).

Historically, tenure-track faculty members were expected to teach an average of 12 WTU per term and to devote the equivalent of 3 WTU of time to indirect instructional activities. Indirect instructional activities were those not tied to a specific class (such as curriculum development, student advisement, and committee service). Twelve WTU would equate to four 3-credit lecture classes per semester (8 classes per year) or the equivalent effort for other types of instruction. Small variances on this standard were permitted from one term to the next, and in addition, faculty members could be given non-instructional assignments (“assigned time”, also allocated in WTU) in lieu of teaching a class.

The collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with the California Faculty Association governs current policy on faculty workloadⁱ. The “12 plus 3” WTU standard was eliminated from the CBA in 1995. However, most full-time tenure-track faculty have assignments (including instruction and “assigned time”) that add up to between 11 and 12 WTU each academic term, and some tenure-track faculty occasionally voluntarily carry more than 12 WTU of instruction in a term.

Sources of information and notes on terms:

Throughout this document, we will use the term “tenure-track faculty” to refer to *all* instructional faculty either holding or eligible for tenure, including those who have received tenure (“tenured faculty”) and those who are eligible for tenure but have not yet received it (“probationary faculty”). The term “lecturer” refers to instructional faculty members who have temporary appointments and are not eligible for tenure (sometimes known as “adjunct faculty”). Where information regarding “other instructors” is presented, this category includes graduate teaching assistants (TAs) as well as a small number of volunteers and administrators with teaching assignments.

Most of the information presented comes from either the CSU’s Academic Planning Database (APDB)ⁱⁱ or the Personnel/Payroll Information Management System (PIMS)ⁱⁱⁱ. Faculty records in the APDB were matched to records stored in PIMS in order to identify faculty who were tenure-track versus lecturers and others.

Question 1. Number of tenure-track faculty at CSU's 23 campuses

In fall 2012, the CSU had **9,934 tenured and probationary faculty** (9,656 full-time equivalent positions) at its 23 campuses. This count includes all tenured or probationary faculty members who were active as of October 31, 2012, including participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program and individuals on sabbatical leave during the fall 2012 term. For a campus-by-campus breakdown of tenure-track faculty as of fall 2012 as well as lecturers/adjunct faculty, see Appendix 2.

Question 2. Average number of classes taught each semester by tenure-track faculty

CSU faculty members teach both regular classes offered in a variety of instructional formats (lecture, seminar, discussion, laboratory, small group activity) and "supervision" classes including independent study, directed research, supervision of student teachers, thesis supervision, and the like. Online classes and hybrid classes (where some portion of class time is face-to-face and some is online) are generally counted and credited as regular classes.

There are seventeen CSU campuses on a semester calendar. For these campuses, over the past three years (2009/10 through 2011/12), **CSU tenure-track faculty taught an average of 3.0 regular classes per semester**. If supervision assignments are included, the average increases to 4.3 classes per semester.^{iv}

There are six CSU campuses with quarter calendars. At quarter campuses, the academic year is divided into 3 quarters instead of two semesters. Because a quarter is shorter than a semester (about 10 weeks of instruction versus 15 weeks for a semester), the typical lecture class at a campus on the quarter system meets for more hours per week than the typical class at a semester campus. As a consequence, faculty at quarter campuses normally teach slightly fewer class sections per term than faculty at semester campuses. Over the past three years, tenure-track faculty at quarter campuses in the CSU taught an average of **2.8 regular classes per quarter**. When supervision classes are included, the average increases to 4.0 classes per quarter.

Questions 3 and 4. Percentage of total classes at CSU taught by tenured and probationary faculty; percentage of total classes at CSU taught by adjuncts, lecturers, and other instructors

The table below presents the percentage of all classes taught by tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and all others in the fall 2011 term. Tenure-track faculty taught a majority of all classes. As noted earlier, the category "other" includes graduate students working as teaching assistants as well as a small number of volunteers and administrators with teaching assignments.

Percent of all Classes Taught		
Tenure-track	Lecturer	Other
51.4%	40.4%	8.2%

Question 5. Average number of credit hours taught by tenured and probationary faculty each year

The CSU does not make assignments to its tenure-track faculty by the credit hour; rather, it uses a system of "weighted teaching units", or WTU, as described previously. For those faculty members who exclusively teach lecture or seminar format classes, credit hours would be the same as WTU, but other modes of instruction have different weighting factors (see Appendix 1 for examples). Tenure-track faculty in the CSU taught an average of **19.4 WTU per year** (or 9.7 per term) over the past three years. The WTU reported include those for classroom instruction as well as supervision, plus a small amount of

assigned time (about 0.2 WTU per term) provided to account for additional teaching effort associated with very large classes and non-traditional instruction. For these averages, semester and quarter campuses were combined, but the assigned WTU at quarter campuses were weighted by a factor of 2/3 to make the annual WTU comparable to those at semester campuses.

Question 6. Average number of lower-division classes taught by tenured and probationary faculty vs. upper division classes

In fall 2011, 34.7% of all classes (regular and supervision) offered were lower division, 47.7% were upper division, and 17.6% were graduate level courses. The teaching assignment of the average tenure-track faculty member reflected a somewhat lower proportion of lower division classes and a higher proportion of upper division and graduate classes; in the fall 2011 term, for example, the total of 4.2 classes (including supervision) taught by the average tenure-track faculty member included, on average, 0.8 lower division classes, 2.3 upper division classes, and 1.1 graduate classes.

The table below shows the *percent of all classes* (including supervision) at each level (lower division, upper division, and graduate) taught by tenure-track faculty in fall 2011. ^v

Level	Number of Classes	% Taught by Tenure-track
Lower Division	27,524	28.9%
Upper Division	37,843	58.8%
Graduate	13,952	75.7%
Total	79,319	51.4%

Question 7. Average number of professors granted tenure each year

From fall 2008 through fall 2012, the CSU has granted tenure to 2,291 faculty members, or an average of 458 per year.

Question 8. CSU's policy on sabbaticals as detailed in its agreement with the California Faculty Association

Article 27 of the Collective bargaining Agreement with CFA describes the terms for the award of sabbaticals in the CSU. Article 27 is provided as Appendix 3.

The key provisions include the following:

- Eligibility requires full-time service at a campus for six years out of the seven year period preceding a leave, as well as at least six years of full-time service after any prior sabbatical or difference-in-pay leave.
- Purposes of sabbatical leaves are typically research, scholarly, or creative activity, instructional improvement, or faculty retraining.
- Applications undergo peer review for merit.
- Applications are also reviewed for impacts on department operations, curricular impact, other campus program needs, and budget implications.
- Individuals who take sabbatical leaves must render service to the university upon return, at the rate of at least one term of service for each term of leave.
- Before final approval of a sabbatical, applicants must file a bond, statement of assets, and/or promissory note at least equal to the amount of salary paid during the leave. This is a guarantee

against loss should the faculty member fail to render the required service upon return from sabbatical.

- Sabbaticals may be for one semester or quarter at full pay, two quarters at $\frac{3}{4}$ pay, or an academic year at one-half pay.
- Provided there are enough applications that have been recommended for funding based on the above reviews, the contract calls for each campus to fund sabbaticals for at least 12% of the eligible population each year. If the campus does not fund sabbaticals for at least 12% of eligible faculty, then the contract calls for those sabbaticals that were denied for reasons other than the merit of the proposal to be deferred to the following year.

Question 9. The percentage of tenured and probationary faculty typically on sabbatical each semester and the percentage of tenured faculty that represents

Because six years of full-time service (the length of the normal probationary period for a probationary faculty member) are required before a faculty member becomes eligible for a sabbatical, virtually all tenure-track faculty members who take sabbaticals have been granted tenure. All proposals for sabbaticals also are peer-reviewed for merit. Based on information from the Personnel/Payroll Information Management System (PIMS), over the past three years the average number of tenured faculty on sabbatical in any given semester was about 290, or about **4%** of all tenured faculty.

Question 10. The average class size for lower-division students vs. average class size for upper-division students

The CSU publishes a report every year of average class sizes for the fall term at the lower division and upper division levels, based on records from the Academic Planning Database. These averages exclude supervision classes. The average class size reported for fall 2012 was 36.8 at the lower division and 31.3 at the upper division. These averages have remained fairly constant since fall 2009.

Average Class Size, Fall 2012	
Lower Division	Upper Division
36.8	31.3

Question 11. Number of hours tenured and probationary faculty spend, on average, each week on instruction and instruction-related activities, and the percentage of undergraduates they teach

Hours spent on instruction and instruction-related activities

As noted above, historical policies on faculty workload equate one WTU to about 3 hours of total effort by the faculty member per week. In addition, all tenure-track faculty members are expected to allocate the equivalent of 3 additional WTU of effort to indirect instructional activities not tied to a specific class (curriculum development, student advisement, committee service, *etc.*). CSU historical workload policies assume these indirect instructional activities amount to 4-9 hours per week, on average.

CSU faculty members are not expected to track the actual hours they spend on teaching, class preparation, grading, and so forth, and it is further understood that the amount of time spent from week to week may vary substantially over the course of a semester depending on the class schedule, assignments, student needs, and so forth. However, we are providing *estimates* based on the average number of direct instructional WTU per full-time equivalent faculty member^{vi} (after removing the number of faculty on sabbatical leaves), using 3 hours per direct instructional WTU and 4-9 hours for indirect instructional activities not associated with specific classes. The use of full-time equivalents in

this table (as opposed to headcounts) accounts for the slightly higher direct instructional WTU per term compared to Question 5, which used headcounts.

Estimated Average Hours per Term per Full-time Equivalent Tenure-Track Faculty Member on Instruction and Instruction-Related Activities			
Direct Instructional WTU	Direct Instructional Hours	Additional Indirect Hours	Total Hours
10.0	30.0	4-9	34-39

As the table shows, we estimate that tenure-track faculty in recent years have been spending, on average, about 30 hours per week on direct instruction and activities related to the classes taught, and 34 to 39 hours a week when indirect instructional activities are included. The remainder of faculty effort is spent on research, scholarly, and creative activities (which are required for tenure and promotion, and which support the instructional mission both indirectly and directly) and a variety of tasks assigned by the university, such as departmental chair duties, accreditation activities, other special projects, and unusually heavy responsibilities for student advisement or committee service. This is consistent with past surveys, in which CSU faculty reported spending a total of about 50 hours per week on all activities, including between 35 and 36 hours in direct instruction, student advisement, and committee service.^{vii}

Percentage of undergraduates taught by tenure-track faculty

CSU students regularly take classes from tenure-track faculty across their undergraduate careers. The best measure of the percentage of undergraduates receiving instruction from tenure-track faculty at a point in time is to look at student credit units, by level. For a course, student credit units are calculated by multiplying the number of students enrolled times the number of units of degree credit the course carries. In fall 2011, about **46% of all undergraduate student credit units** were taught by tenure-track faculty. The table below shows the breakdown between lower division, upper division, and graduate level classes.

Level	Number of student credit units	% taught by tenure-track
Lower Division	2,470,724	34.6%
Upper Division	2,713,161	56.4%
Graduate	410,212	66.9%
Total	5,594,097	47.5%

Question 12. Minimum academic workload for tenured and probationary faculty

Academic workload for tenure-track faculty includes responsibilities that may include teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession, and community, and may vary in composition from one semester to the next. The workload provisions of the collective bargaining agreement with the California Faculty Association recognize these broad responsibilities. The CBA does not specify “minimum” requirements in any of the areas of faculty responsibility. Instead, the composition of these responsibilities is determined by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the department and/or the individual faculty member, consistent with department and student needs. While nearly all CSU tenure-track faculty members, including most department chairs, teach every semester, it is possible for a tenure-track faculty member to have an assignment that does not include any direct instruction in a given term.

Endnotes

ⁱ Workload provisions in the collective bargaining agreement with CFA are contained in Article 20. The CBA is available at http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/2012-2014/.

ⁱⁱ The APDB contains information reported by each campus on classes offered, enrollments, class characteristics, credit hours, instructor, contribution to instructor workload, and other parameters. The data are submitted after the enrollment census date for each term. Faculty members will have a record in the APDB if they received a teaching assignment or assigned time in a given term.

ⁱⁱⁱ The PIMS database contains appointment information, employment status, and employment history for all CSU employees. Reports from PIMS are obtained using the Campus Information Retrieval System (CIRS).

^{iv} All data regarding average number of classes taught by tenure-track faculty are from the APDB. Averages are derived by identifying all tenure-track faculty (determined by cross-matching APDB records with PIMS records) with a record in APDB for that term and dividing the total number of classes taught by the number of faculty. Non-supervision classes were identified using course classification numbers assigned to the classes. The course classification number system is a method for identifying the mode of instruction associated with a class (such as large lecture, lecture-discussion, seminar, activity, laboratory) or, in the case of supervision classes, the type of work being supervised. For this study, all classes with classification numbers ranging from 01 to 21 were counted as non-supervision classes.

^v In general, based on their academic preparation and qualifications, CSU tenure-track faculty are expected to take primary responsibility for advanced undergraduate and graduate work.

^{vi} Full-time equivalent faculty (FTE) is calculated using data from PIMS as of October 31 each year and represents the sum of the time base of all tenure-track faculty members, including department chairs and others with reduced teaching assignments due to reimbursement from grants or contracts. The number has been adjusted by removing the average number of individuals on sabbatical leave.

^{vii} See the 2003 Comparative Faculty Workload report, <http://www.calstate.edu/acadres/docs/CFW-Report-10.pdf>.

Appendix 1. CSU Faculty Workload: Definitions and Key Concepts

Components of faculty work

- Tenure-track faculty work falls into 3 general areas: teaching; research, scholarly, and creative activity; university and community service.
- In general, lecturers are given assignments based only on teaching. However, they are expected to maintain currency in their academic disciplines. Some lecturers may receive specific assignments that involve service or scholarly activities.

Weighted Teaching Units (WTU)

- The CSU uses a weighting system to determine the appropriate teaching credit for instructional assignments. It is assumed that faculty members spend a total of about 3 hours per week in instruction and instruction-associated activities (preparation, grading, meeting with students, etc.) for each WTU.
- Lecture and seminar classes carry one WTU for each hour of class meeting time per week and one WTU for each unit of credit that a student would receive.
- Hybrid and on-line sections of classes are normally credited with the same number of WTU as their face-to-face counterparts, but campuses may adjust the WTU credit if additional effort is required.
- Other modes of instruction that require relatively more class time but less time outside of class have different weights. Some examples:
 - Science labs provide 2 WTU for each 3 hours of time in the lab, which corresponds to one unit of student credit.
 - Computer labs provide 1.3 WTU for each 2 hours of time in the lab, corresponding to one unit of student credit.
- Supervision classes, which feature one-on-one instruction, are assigned WTU based on the number of students supervised (regardless of the number of credit hours for which the student is enrolled) and the number of hours per week that the supervision is expected to require. Some examples:
 - Supervision of a master's thesis is credited with 0.5 WTU per student.
 - Supervision of a student seeking a Master's in Social Work is credited with 1 WTU per student.
 - Undergraduate independent study or directed research is credited with 0.25 to 0.33 WTU per student.

Indirect Instructional Activities

- Tenure-track faculty members are expected to perform the equivalent of 3 WTU per term of "indirect instructional activities" (activities that support the CSU academic program but are not tied to a specific class).
- Typical activities might include student advisement, committee service, curriculum development, etc.

Assigned Time

- Faculty members can receive “assigned time” – assignment to non-teaching activities – that reduces the number of courses they actually teach.
- Some assigned time is treated as equivalent to direct instruction. The most common type of assigned time in this category is provided for the extra work associated with teaching large classes, which may be assigned for classes with enrollments greater than 120. Assigned time may also be provided for non-traditional instruction.
- The largest category of assigned time is for carrying out research projects and scholarly and creative activity. CSU faculty research often directly involves advanced undergraduate and graduate students and is frequently supported by external grants and contracts.
- Other uses include providing time for departmental administrative duties, accreditation activities, assessment activities, special university projects, or any of the “indirect instructional activities” described above if they are unusually time-consuming.
- Union representatives may be given reduced teaching assignments to allow for their participation in bargaining and other union activities. The terms for this “release time” are specified in Article 6 of the collective bargaining agreement.

Historical workload norms

- Historically, tenure-track faculty members were expected to teach an average of 12 WTU per term and perform the equivalent of 3 WTU of indirect instructional activities.
- Fluctuations from term to term were permissible
- Faculty members with assigned time would have a reduced teaching load.
- Since 1995, the “12 + 3” expectation is no longer a part of the collective bargaining agreement. However, it is still considered to be one factor to be used in determining faculty assignments.
- Part-time lecturer appointments continue to be based on the total number of WTU assigned, with 15 WTU per semester considered full-time.
- Despite the fact that the “12 + 3” standard is no longer in place, most CSU tenure-track faculty carry between 11 and 12 WTU per term of direct teaching plus assigned time.

Appendix 2. Full-time Equivalent Faculty by Tenure-track Status, by Campus

Campus	Tenure-track Faculty FTE	Lecturer FTE	Total Faculty FTE
Bakersfield	180.1	116.2	296.2
Channel Islands	85.0	144.7	229.7
Chico	434.3	223.2	657.6
Dominguez Hills	195.4	229.3	424.7
East Bay	287.5	193.7	481.1
Fresno	502.6	343.7	846.3
Fullerton	722.1	602.5	1,324.6
Humboldt	220.3	150.6	370.9
Long Beach	768.5	543.6	1,312.1
Los Angeles	495.5	294.0	789.6
Maritime	45.3	19.2	64.4
Monterey Bay	119.9	138.9	258.8
Northridge	775.9	507.3	1,283.2
Pomona	490.5	292.5	783.0
Sacramento	597.5	310.5	908.0
San Bernardino	368.2	244.0	612.1
San Diego	707.0	323.4	1,030.3
San Francisco	706.3	407.5	1,113.8
San Jose	627.8	528.0	1,155.8
San Luis Obispo	630.8	255.2	886.0
San Marcos	229.0	181.7	410.7
Sonoma	234.2	114.0	348.1
Stanislaus	232.3	110.5	342.8
Total	9,655.9	6,273.8	15,929.7

All data are from the Campus Information Retrieval System (CIRS) AN file as of October 31, 2012; CIRS is the user interface for extraction of records from PIMS. Full-time equivalents are obtained by adding up the time base of individuals in each category. Most tenure-track faculty are full time; however, the majority of lecturers hold-part-time positions.

Appendix 3. Excerpt from the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the CSU and the California Faculty Association.

ARTICLE 27

SABBATICAL LEAVES

- 27.1 A sabbatical leave shall be for purposes that provide a benefit to the CSU, such as research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement or faculty retraining.
- 27.2 A full-time faculty unit employee shall be eligible for a sabbatical leave if s/he has served full-time for six (6) years at that campus in the preceding seven (7) year period prior to the leave and at least six (6) years after any previous sabbatical leave or difference in pay leave. Credit granted towards the completion of the probationary period for service elsewhere shall also apply towards fulfilling the eligibility requirements for a sabbatical. A leave of absence without pay or service in an academic administrative appointment excluded from the bargaining unit shall not constitute a break in service for eligibility requirements.
- 27.3 The faculty unit employee shall submit an application for a sabbatical leave. The application shall include a statement of the purpose of the sabbatical, a description of the proposed project and the CSU resources, if any, necessary to carry it out, and a statement of the time requested, which shall not exceed one (1) year.
- 27.4 Application and response deadlines shall be established by the President after considering recommendations from the Professional Leave Committee.
- 27.5 A Professional Leave Committee composed of tenured faculty unit employees shall review sabbatical applications. The Professional Leave Committee shall be elected by probationary and tenured faculty unit employees. A faculty unit employee applying for a sabbatical leave shall not be eligible for election to the Professional Leave Committee. The recommendation ensuing from such a review shall be submitted to the appropriate administrator. This review shall consider questions related to the quality of the proposed sabbatical project.
- 27.6 A copy of the application shall be sent to the faculty unit employee's department. The department shall provide a statement to the appropriate administrator regarding the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department should the employee be granted a sabbatical.
- 27.7 Prior to making a recommendation to the President regarding the sabbatical leave application, the appropriate administrator shall consider the recommendations pursuant to provisions 27.5 and 27.6, other campus program needs and campus budget implications.

- 27.8 Prior to making a final determination regarding the sabbatical leave and the conditions of such an approved leave, the President shall consider the recommendations made pursuant to provisions 27.5, 27.6, and 27.7. The President shall respond in writing to the applicant and such a response shall include the reasons for approval or denial. If a sabbatical leave is granted, the response shall include any conditions of such a leave. A copy of this response shall be provided to the affected department and the Professional Leave Committee. If a sabbatical leave is denied based on factors other than the merit of the proposal as identified in 27.6 or 27.7, and such denial results in fewer sabbaticals being awarded than 12% of eligible faculty as defined in 27.10, upon request of the faculty unit employee, the sabbatical leave shall be deferred until the following academic year, at which point the leave, if the underlying conditions supporting the proposal remain in effect, shall be granted.
- 27.9 Final approval of a sabbatical leave shall not be granted until the applicant has filed with the President a suitable bond or an accepted statement of assets (not including PERS holdings) and/or a promissory note that is individually or collectively at least equal to the amount of salary paid during the leave. The guarantee posted shall indemnify the State of California against loss in the event the employee fails to render the required service in the CSU following return of the employee from the sabbatical leave. The guarantee posted shall immediately be canceled in full upon completion of required service or upon waiver of that service by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the CSU.
- 27.10
- a. It is the intent of this Article that faculty unit employees eligible for sabbatical leave who meet the conditions of this Article receive their sabbatical leave, subject to provision 27.7.
 - b. Effective beginning with sabbatical leaves granted for the 2007-2008 academic year, all applications for sabbatical leave at one-half (1/2) of full salary shall be approved if they meet the criteria set forth in provisions 27.5 – 27.8. If there are a sufficient number of faculty unit employees eligible for sabbatical leave who meet the conditions of this Article, then a campus shall grant no fewer sabbatical leaves than twelve percent (12%) of the total number of campus faculty unit employees eligible to apply for such leaves in that year in addition to those faculty approved for a sabbatical at one-half (1/2) of full salary. Sabbaticals deferred according to 27.8 shall be counted in the year they are taken.
 - c. Arrangements may be developed by the department and approved by the President to accommodate granting sabbatical leaves for faculty unit employees whose leaves have been approved. Such arrangements may include rearranging workload within the department, and other University funding. No faculty unit employee will be involuntarily required to work in an overload situation by such arrangements.

27.11 The salary of an academic year faculty employee or an academic year counselor faculty unit employee on a sabbatical leave shall be in accordance with the following:

- a. one (1) semester at full salary;
- b. two (2) semesters at one-half (1/2) of full salary;
- c. one (1) quarter at full salary;
- d. two (2) quarters at three-fourths (3/4) of full salary;
- e. three (3) quarters at one-half (1/2) of full salary.

The salary of a librarian, 12 month faculty employee, or 12-month counselor faculty unit employee on a sabbatical leave shall be in accordance with the following:

At semester campuses:

- f. four (4) months at full salary;
- g. eight (8) months at one-half (1/2) of full salary.

At quarter campuses:

- h. three (3) months at full salary;
- i. six (6) months at three-fourths (3/4) of full salary;
- j. nine (9) months at one-half (1/2) of full salary.

27.12 The start date of a sabbatical for a 12-month faculty employee with instructional responsibilities shall coincide with the start date of the appropriate academic term.

27.13 Faculty employees serving as department chairs (class codes 2481, 2482) shall be assigned to the equivalent 12-month or academic year instructional faculty classification (e.g. 2361, 2360) for the duration of the sabbatical, and will not receive the department chair stipend while on sabbatical leave.

27.14 If a faculty unit employee occupies a split position with both academic year and 12-month components, the higher appointment time base will normally be used to establish whether the faculty unit employee is placed into an academic year position or a 12-month position for the duration of the sabbatical. Upon request of the faculty unit employee and approval of the appropriate administrator, a faculty unit employee whose majority appointment is on a 12-month basis may be assigned to an academic year position for the duration of the sabbatical.

27.15 A sabbatical of two (2) semesters or two (2) or three (3) quarters may be implemented within a two (2) consecutive year period, subject to the recommendations of the

- Professional Leave Committee and the appropriate administrator and the approval of the President.
- 27.16 A faculty unit employee on sabbatical leave shall be considered in work status and shall receive health, dental and appropriate fringe benefits provided by the CSU in the same manner as if s/he were not on sabbatical leave.
- 27.17 A faculty unit employee on sabbatical leave shall be entitled to accrue sick leave, vacation, and service credit toward service salary increase eligibility, eligibility toward promotion, if applicable, and seniority.
- 27.18 A faculty unit employee on sabbatical leave shall not accept additional and/or outside employment without prior approval of the President.
- 27.19 A faculty unit employee granted a sabbatical leave may be required by the President to provide verification that the conditions of the leave were met. The statement of verification shall be provided to the President and the Professional Leave Committee.
- 27.20 A faculty unit employee shall render service to the CSU upon return from a sabbatical leave at the rate of one (1) term of service for each term of leave.