

Meeting Summary

Faculty Workload Focus Group

Through January 29, 2010

Present: Bill Byrnes, Chair, Kyle Bishop – English, Daniel Eves – Chemistry/Physical Science, Artis Grady – Nutrition Science, Michael Harvey – Theatre & Dance, David Shwab – Psychology, Bruce Tebbs – Provost's Office staff
Not Present: Donna Lister – Nursing, David McGuire – HR

I. Subcommittee recommendations on Policy 6.1 data about teaching loads

1. Include workload percentage range in policy to assist with LRT process and clarify expectations for faculty, chairs, and LRT committees
2. Add wording to better reflect Boyer Model covering such areas as internships, guided student research, course development/design, – 6.1, Subsection IV. A. 2.
3. More tightly define what is meant by “acceptable levels of professional service, 6.1.Subsection IV.A.3. More clarity needed on committee assignments.
4. Reassess base teaching loads assuming SUU is classified differently than a regional masters level university – consider 12/9 or 9/12 teaching load
5. Add wording about flex load option in 6.1. For some faculty their load might be heavier in teaching, other in research, scholarly or artistic, or even in service.

II. Review of subcommittee recommendations on Policy 6.27 about workload

1. Change policy to reflect tenure, tenure-track, non-tenured faculty, and adjunct appointment options at SUU and eliminate duplicate wording between policy and addendum.
2. Consider eliminating the addendum and revise the policy to reflect SUU practices and refer to BOR Policy 485
3. Offer explicit wording about why overloads are not to be seen as a good practice
4. Consider adding some wording about not having more than x number of semesters someone can teach on overload
5. Have the Provost undertake an investigation of the reasons why some faculty are teaching excessive overloads every semester and report to the Faculty Senate his findings
6. Strike paragraph from Policy 6.27, Attachment B. 10 regarding the 1.33 to 1 for online classes
7. Summer teaching needs to be a factor in Policy 6.27

III. Comment on Policy 6.35 – Faculty Preparations?

- ✓ Current limit of 5 but more OK with chair OK
Focus group suggesting updating the policy and making approval of course preps include the college Dean. Five preps or fewer preps may be fine for a new assistant professor while 6 to 8 may be appropriate for a more senior faculty members.

IV. Committees – Review of draft document on SUU committees

- ✓ Approximately 44 committees with membership possibility of 333 voting members
Associate Provost Byrnes reviewed the document and indicated it was still a work in progress. He indicated a database needed to be developed to better track and report on committee assignments.

V. Review of College/School Faculty Workload Process & Procedure Comparisons

The committee discussed the side by side comparison of the responses by the dean's to four questions about workload: Current college practice on how are teaching loads assigned, How are committee assignments made, How have college workload procedures reflected Policy 6.27, and What impact do accrediting agencies have on workload.

The committee concluded enormous discretion is left to the chairs and dean oversight varies in its rigor from college to college. There is also inconsistent tracking of committee assignments in each college. The committee feels a more uniform workload assignment system needs to be developed and implemented and that dean's need to take an active role in ensuring workload policies are being followed.

VI. Other Items?

The committee feels the current practice of capping enrollment in sections of online classes at 25 needs to be done away with. It is a practice that creates a significant imbalance in the number of students a faculty member may teach in a face-to-face class. For example, if a face-to-face General Education 1010 class is capped at 60, an online class should be capped at the same number. Also, online classes need to be treated as part of load and should be carefully monitored regarding a faculty member's entire workload.

The committee also expressed support for the idea of incrementally increasing overload compensation to \$1000 per credit for undergraduate courses and \$1200 per credit for graduate courses.

I. Notes from January 13 meeting

1. Fall 2009 – of 228 FTE faculty about 40% were teaching 13.0 or more credits
2. 18 faculty were listed as teaching 20 or more ICH in the fall
3. Here's a sample of some of the data: Education faculty member had 65 ICH, Communication Dept faculty member with 30.7 ICH, Math faculty member 31 ICH, Music faculty member 21 ICH, Ten Science faculty over 13 ICH with the highest at 27.2, Several Business School faculty with 20 or more ICH
4. Two subcommittees were created to look at specific recommendations regarding existing policies
5. Workload relative to committee and service was discussed. Just how does each college/school determine workload assignments?

II. Notes from December 2 meeting

1. 228.2 FTE Faculty Fall semester
2. TOTAL CONTACT HOURS = 3071.1 or 13.46 per faculty
3. TOTAL ICH (Instructional Credit Hours) = 2992.1 or 13.11 per faculty
4. TOTAL SCH = 69,592.5 or an average 305 per faculty
5. Workload isn't just about courses taught or students supervised, it is about all the other expectations – committee service and expectations about scholarship
6. IDEA: Can we think of a 12/9 model if we become a liberal arts university?
7. We have out of date policies and policies that are not linked to current practice – eg. 6.27 and 6.1
8. IDEA: What about more clear quantitative breakdowns for teaching, scholarship and service effort e.g. 60%, 30%, 10% with the assumption that collegiality is underlying all three areas
9. Lack of consistent application of 6.1 issues across departments... What is really being required or asked for in the FAAR's?
10. IDEA: Add more specific % or points relative to faculty as in 6.27 for chairs?
11. Policy 6.27 #10 Distance Delivery needs tweaking
12. IDEA: Create a Committee Database kept at Provost's office for academic committees which would list length of expect service and how often the committee works, what the expected hours of committee work will be both in and out of meetings
13. IDEA: Some discretion on teaching load? Consider two or three year average?

III. Faculty Workload Issues (summary responses from SWOT sessions)

- Conflicting messages on work load
- Expectations for scholarly effort are too high given the teaching loads
- Heavy teaching load / work load (not just the 4-4 : individualization, taking the time to help the students excel but that takes time
- In graduate programs
- In order to do student research it requires faculty members to work nights, weekends, etc. – extra work isn't taken into consideration
- Inconsistent across campus Heavy work load – not able to do our jobs as well as we'd like too because of lack of time
- Intense; Burnout
- Loads are putting a lid on professional development
- Scholarship and class loads are too high
- Standardization of load across campus for teaching graduate classes vs. undergraduate classes
- Teaching load vs. student oriented activities
- Work load expectations (need to get out of just being in "survival mode")
- Work load is too high – too much weight on research, not enough time to do all that is required (hard to find a balance)