

Eastern Kentucky University

Faculty Senate

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload

March 2001

Members:

William Abney
Patricia Birchfield
Marcia MacLaren
Frank O'Connor, Chair
Alan Schick
Gary Steinbach
Joyce Thomas
Margaret Yoder

INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Senate created the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workload in October 1999. The Committee did not receive a detailed charge from the Faculty Senate. The Chair of the Senate indicated that comparative information from our benchmark institutions should be included in our deliberations. Information was also obtained on the regional universities in Kentucky. The Committee identified other issues that it considered worthy of discussion and study. These include the impact of changes in the typical teaching load, the effect of technology on workload, and equity of workload across campus.

CURRENT POLICY

The Policy

The policy on faculty work load at Eastern Kentucky University is set forth in page 103 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook 1998-2000 and is further elaborated in the Policy and Procedure Manual for Academic Affairs and Research under Human Resources Management, Section A 4.h.1-3. Copies of the two documents are given in Appendix A.

The main point of the statement in the Faculty/Staff Handbook is that the standard teaching load is 12 semester credit hours with appropriate adjustment for size and type of class. It further points out the desirability of adjustment in teaching load for faculty with substantial service responsibilities, administrative responsibilities, and faculty who teach graduate classes or engage regularly in significant scholarly activities including grant proposals. The policy was approved by the Board of Regents on July 30, 1987.

The more detailed statement in the Policy and Procedure Manual for Academic Affairs and Research outlines the conditions under which a reduction in teaching load is appropriate and the activities for which it may be approved. The central premise is that departments need to generate credit hour production that is at least as large as the number of F.T.E. positions in the department. The statement also calls for flexibility for chairs and deans in how to generate the credit hours. It calls for a 12 hour teaching load including equivalent adjusted loads based on contact hours. Provision for reduced teaching load is provided for a series of activities including research, provided certain conditions are met.

Administration of the Policy

The policy has been carried out in a reasonably consistent fashion for faculty members with administrative and service responsibilities. These include department chairs, program directors, such as MBA Director in the Business College, and other assignments such as the Extended Campus office. In addition, it has been standard practice to allow a reduction in teaching load for service as chair of Faculty Senate or faculty regent. It has been the policy that faculty preparing a course on KTLN for the first time are given a

three hour reduction in teaching load.

The provision allowing for reduced teaching load for scholarly activity and graduate teaching has been applied in some parts of the university but not in others. The former College of Business had a policy of having a nine-hour teaching load for a faculty member teaching a graduate class. This is required by the accrediting agency (AACSB) on the grounds that there is a greater research expectation for those teaching graduate courses. In some instances, faculty active in research had a nine-hour teaching load even when they did not have a graduate class. It is our understanding that in the two business departments of the new College of Business and Technology, a faculty member who is active in research will have a nine-hour teaching load.

The College of Law Enforcement is another unit where reduced teaching loads are common. This seems to reflect the fact that the College obtains a substantial amount of outside funding for training and research. The policy does not call for faculty teaching a graduate course to have a reduced teaching load but this is arranged in particular cases. In the remaining colleges, it is common for faculty teaching graduate courses to have a 12-hour load. Indeed, there were cases where a faculty member had more than one graduate course and a 12-hour load.

Where a research grant provides for purchase of a faculty member's time, a reduction in teaching load is a standard practice campus wide.

COMPARABLE INSTITUTIONS

We obtained information on workload policies and their operation from both our benchmark universities and the other regional universities in Kentucky. A summary of the basic information is provided in Table 1. The general teaching standard at these schools is a 12-hour teaching load. All have provision for adjustment of teaching load for administrative assignments such as department chair or head of an honors program. Buying back time through an externally funded grant is standard when release time is part of the grant provisions. It also the case that almost all have nine-hour teaching loads in their Colleges of Business and in the remaining cases, a nine-hour teaching load for faculty with graduate courses. Law schools have a six-hour teaching load.

Benchmark Universities

In areas other than business and law, the benchmark institutions differ not in their base line teaching loads as stated in policy manuals but in the realized teaching load, as measured by the number of semester credit hours of classes taught. Among the benchmark schools there is a continuum from schools with a 12 hour teaching load without much exception, such as, Youngstown State, the two California schools and East Tennessee State to universities where a nine hour teaching load is standard practice or

Table 1. Teaching Load Policy and Practices at Comparable Institutions
Summary of Basic Information

EKU Benchmark Institutions

Ball State	12-hr. load; defacto load is 9hrs. Average is 9. hrs
CSU Fresno	12-hr load; formula for calculating load, lecture with 40 students is three weighted teaching units; so is an accounting class with 25 or an undergraduate seminar with 20. Business has 9 hr. load
CSU Sacramento	Essentially the same as CSU Fresno
C. Missouri U.	12 hr. load except in business school where 9 hr. load is standard
E. Carolina U.	12-hr. undergraduate; 9-hr. load graduate Business has 9hr. load; Did study of workload but do not have resources to implement 9 hr. load campuswide
ETSU	Standard load is 12 hr. They have a state mandated 15 hr. load which they manipulate. Business school has 9 hr. load
Grand Valley State Univ.	12 regular contact hr. load. 3hr. lab or studio = 2 regular hr. Provision for reduction for research. No information on extent.
Illinois State U.	Base 12 hr. load. Standard load 9 hr. across campus in BA/MA departments
Indiana State U.	12-hr load; 9 hr load standard in A&S and Business and almost so in professional colleges
Lamar Univ.	12 hr. load. Business school has 9 hr. load as standard.
Marshall	No specific hours but a set of guidelines for the proportion of workload on teaching, BA depts 70-80% teaching, BA/MA departments 60-70% teaching.
S. Illinois U. at Edwardsville	Max load for faculty meeting normal expectations, three courses Reduced load for research etc. Tenured faculty may elect reduction in research expectations with an increase in teaching load not to exceed 12 hours.
UA Little Rock	12 hr. base; Graduate course is counted 1.33 Instructional Units (IU) 3 graduate courses fill the load. Provision for independent study. 5 students = 1IU. Business 9 hr. load - some controversy

Table 1. (Continued)

EKU Benchmark Institutions

Univ of Louisiana at Monroe	12-hr contact base; graduate teaching - 9 hr; reduction for research internally funded as well as externally funded; about 1/4 on reduced load for research
UW-Oskosh	12 hr. load is the base; 9-hr. load if department has on file a plan to generate required FTE'S and faculty member has research plan on file. Half the departments are on the 9 hr. load
West Chester U.	12 hr. undergraduate and 9 hr. graduate
W. Illinois U.	9-11 hr. undergraduate; 10 hr. if graduate teaching Advising is counted in the hours- 17students = 1 cr. hr Labs: 1 hr = 1/2 cr. hour Team teaching: all credited if involved for full smester
Youngstown S. U.	12 hr. teaching load. No adjustment for graduate teaching. Lower hours in Business

Other Regional Universities in Kentucky

Morehead	12hr. load for undergraduate and 9 hr. load for graduate teaching.
Murray State	12-hr load, contact hours can vary from 12 to 25, depending on on discipline; research is encouraged.
NKU	12 hr. standard; Business school has lower load.
Western	12hr. base; provision for reduction in teaching load for research; requires an explicit agreement.

close to it. These include Ball State, Indiana State, Illinois State, Marshall University, University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh, and Southern Illinois at Edwardsville. Where a university has some doctoral programs, we are reporting teaching loads in BA/MA departments. Some universities indicated that they had concluded that nine-hour teaching loads were highly desirable but they had not succeeded in obtaining the necessary resources to carry them out.

In most of the benchmark institutions, there is a clear understanding that reduced teaching loads imply an increased commitment to scholarly activity. In many, there are explicit plans in place at either the individual level or the departmental level. The University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh and the University of Southern Illinois at Edwardsville seem to have relatively well developed policies in this respect. Since there are quite comparable institutions to Eastern, their policies and practices may merit more detailed attention.

Other Regional Universities in Kentucky

The other regional comprehensive universities in Kentucky are Morehead, Murray, Northern, and Western. All have a standard 12-semester hour teaching load. Both Morehead and Western indicated that those teaching graduate courses may teach less than 12 hours per semester. In the case of Western, there is an explicit connection between reduction in teaching load for graduate faculty and a program of research. Such reduction would also seem to be available for faculty active in research even when not teaching graduate courses.

FEASIBILITY OF REDUCED TEACHING LOAD

Members of the Committee discussed informally with department chairs, in disciplines adjacent to their own, the potential impact of reducing teaching loads while maintaining the quality of instruction but without increasing the number of faculty positions. There was almost unanimous agreement on the desirability of some reduction in the typical teaching load. Many Chairs believed that it was feasible in their departments. Some pointed out that it was hard to demonstrate for their disciplines that moderate changes in class size had a significant effect on the quality of instruction. A view expressed by a number of people was that a faculty member might be more effective in teaching three sections of forty-six rather than four sections of thirty-two. Two major concerns were raised. In some departments the current classrooms would not allow for increasing the size of sections. The second point raised was that in some disciplines, sections were already as large as would be desirable.

TECHNOLOGY AND WORKLOAD

Perhaps the most significant change in the teaching environment in the past decade is the arrival of new kinds of technology that are available to faculty for teaching. These include e-mail, presentation packages such as Power Point, distance learning technologies, and the internet. The nature and ultimate impact of these developments on what we teach and how we teach is a matter of speculation at this time. Some points are however clear by now. To date, the new technologies have for the most part caused a significant increase in the use of faculty time. The impact of such technologies on student learning is not yet clear. Those selling the technology are sure of its positive impact on learning and teaching effectiveness. More disinterested parties don't find the evidence quite as convincing. Whether the new technologies will allow for substitution of machines or capital for faculty time is an open question. As happened in medicine, it may turn out that we get an increase in quality but no reduction in overall cost. An issue that needs attention is the nature and role of support staff in the new environment. A detailed study of the impact of technology on both the nature of teaching and the use of faculty time is worthy of consideration.

DISCUSSION

During its discussions, the Committee was made aware of the fact that there are concerns in some departments regarding the equity of teaching assignments and advising loads within the department. Some of the issues involve the way in which the 12 hour teaching load is translated into contact hours while others involve questions such as extended campus teaching assignments and changing of schedules at a late date. The Committee believes that such problems are peculiar to particular departments and disciplines and are best solved by the department. The question of how we treat undeclared advising relative to the advising of majors may well be worthy of university wide attention. Paying for advising on a per student basis is reminiscent of an hourly wage mentality and seems to indicate that advising of students is not central to the professional obligations of a faculty member.

Past policy at Eastern was not especially favorable to research and scholarly activity. In particular, there was not an explicit recognition that in most disciplines there is a strong connection over the long run between being active in research and one's ability to offer students an education of high quality. A result in many cases was depreciation in intellectual or human capital, which ultimately had a negative effect on the quality of education offered to our students. This is a hinge time for Eastern. A generation change of significant proportions is occurring among the faculty. A large number of younger faculty members are being hired. The long run health of the institution and its ability to offer education of high quality to undergraduate and Master's students will depend crucially on such faculty maintaining and developing their intellectual capital. In many fields, they are not likely to do so if they have a 12-semester hour teaching load during the academic year and go on to teach six hours in summer. Patterns developed in the

early stages of careers tend to persist. The most effective way for most faculty members to maintain vitality in the classroom over the long run is to be active in scholarly work. In many fields, this involves serious research and a significant commitment of time. There has been increased emphasis on scholarly activity at Eastern in the past couple of years. It is not yet clear that there is acknowledgment that increased scholarly output will require time as well as resources in many fields. In addition to maintaining the intellectual capital of current faculty, the teaching load is also a significant factor in a department's ability to hire faculty of the caliber that the university would wish.

Eastern's role and that of the regional comprehensive university is changing in response to developments in society. A noteworthy development of recent years is the change in expectations regarding qualifications for promotion in organizations, both private and public. A decade ago, having a Masters degree tended to guarantee promotion. Now, many organizations expect a person to have a Master's degree in order to be even considered for advancement and promotion. A consequence of this trend is that regional universities like ECU that are located in Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) will face increased demand for Master's programs, typically on a part-time basis. This development will also result in the need for greater scholarly output on the part of faculty.

If one grants the desirability of moving to a reduction in the typical teaching load, then there are the practical questions of implementation. Does the university have the resources to carry out such a program? It may be possible in some fields to generate additional funding through external grants. It may also be possible to establish a pool of funds for Summer stipends for younger faculty.

Current policy is not radically different from those of our benchmark institutions. Where we differ from some of the institutions is in the practical application of the policy. We recommend that serious consideration be given to adopting a practice similar to the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh or Southern Illinois at Edwardsville where there is variation across departments but where individual departments have specific policies on file regarding scholarly activity and teaching load.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In view of the fact that many seemed unaware of the existence of the current policy, it is recommended that the current policy, or its revised version, be widely circulated to both faculty and administrators.
2. The Committee recommends that Eastern move in the direction of reducing teaching loads. The Committee recognizes that because of the size and diversity of a comprehensive university, it is not possible and, probably not desirable, to have a simple and uniform set of rules governing faculty workload. A policy has to be flexible enough to allow for the many differences across disciplines and departments. We recognize that a uniform reduction in the standard teaching load from 12 hours to 9 hours is not likely to

be feasible under current circumstances. However, it is quite possible that adjustments in teaching load are feasible in a number of areas. Because of the wide variation in disciplines, it is best handled at departmental levels.

It is proposed that a department, or discipline within a department, that wishes to have a reduced teaching load formulate a plan regarding scholarly activity and teaching load. Such a plan would indicate how the department proposes to generate its FTE credit hours, or an equivalent measure of output, and the nature of its research and scholarly activities. The plan would also include the plans of individual faculty in the department regarding research and scholarly activity. Where appropriate, the plan would also deal with the service responsibilities of the department. The plan would be submitted for approval to the Dean of the College and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. On approval, the plan would provide the framework for decisions regarding the allocation of workload in the department or discipline, as the case may be.

3. It is recommended that a benefit-cost analysis of the role of technology in the university be undertaken. Such a study would examine the effectiveness of technology in enhancing instruction and its cost in both monetary expenditures and faculty time.
4. It is recommended that the policy regarding advising be examined, as it relates to the treatment of undeclared advising relative to advising majors.

APPENDIX A

Board of Regents
July 30, 1987

FACULTY WORKLOAD

Faculty workload consists of three major areas of responsibility: teaching, service, and research.

The standard teaching load of full-time faculty members with the rank of assistant professor or above is 12 semester hours. Size and type of class, not simply number of credit hours, may be considered in establishing an equitable teaching load. Included in the teaching responsibility are such activities as class preparation, maintaining reasonable office hours, grading, and conferences with students.

While the teaching responsibility alone takes the bulk of the available time for faculty, they also have an obligation to carry a fair share of the service responsibility to the University (normally through committee service and student advising), to the community (related to one's professional expertise), and to the profession (through participation in appropriate professional organizations).

In addition, faculty members have an obligation to engage in scholarly activity beyond that required for preparation of classes. Scholarly activity is defined as research, artistic performance, or creative or technical achievement.

Because of the demands of the three parts of the faculty workload, it is desirable to reduce the teaching load for a faculty member carrying an exceptional service load (e.g., chair of a major committee, administrative duties, a heavy advising load or comparable responsibilities). Faculty member who regularly engage in significant scholarly activity (including grant proposals) or who teach at the graduate level may also be considered for a reduced teaching load. All reduced teaching loads, including those of department chair, must be justified and approved through administrative channels.

Faculty responsibilities are not confined to the five-day week, to the operating hours of the university administrative offices, or to the Richmond campus.

President
February 5, 1986

HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Effective management of human resources implies that we are an institution of talented, sensible, sensitive, but not perfect human beings, that it is our job as administrators to help people to work in effective and constructive ways, and that those closest to the problem often have the best solution. It also demands trust. Without trust nothing is attempted, much less achieved.

Effective management of people also implies that judgments will be made and that complete equity of assignments and responsibility is an unattainable goal.

The Council on Higher Education Funding Formula is to be used as a guide in determining the size of the F.T.E. faculty of a department. The F.T.E. faculty of a department includes the following elements:

1. FTE contract faculty assigned instructional duties in the unit
2. FTE part-time faculty
3. FTE contract faculty teaching extended Campus classes as overloads
4. FTE graduate teaching assistants
5. FTE advising within unit, including paid advising
6. FTE administration
7. FTE institutionally funded research
8. FTE service
9. FTE teaching laboratory assistants in lieu of or in addition to graduate teaching assistants
10. FTE sabbatical leaves

A basic management guide is to achieve a departmental/college credit hour production that will generate at least as many C.H.E. formula funded F.T.E. positions as are utilized by the department/college when calculating departmental F.T.E. faculty from items 1-10 above. It is recognized that in a very few disciplines, the C.H.E. Funding Formula does not seem to fit. These disciplines will be identified.

The department chairs and deans should be provided the flexibility, authority, and responsibility to utilize faculty in the most effective and efficient way in order to achieve the basic purposes of the department and college. The central purpose is to provide effective instruction for the students who choose to study at Eastern, including those enrolled in extended campus classes. Coupled with the teaching function is an obligation to provide an effective advising system that will include, beginning with students' initial enrollments, mentor relationships between departmental faculties and students.

It is proposed that the University Policy on Faculty Workload provide flexibility to department chairs in faculty assignments related to teaching, advising, professional development, department/college/ university service, public service, and research.

The basic teaching load of 12 semester hours per semester (including equivalent adjusted loads based on contact hours) for ranks above instructor may take several forms, including:

1. Nine and fifteen semester hours over two semesters.
2. Other combinations that may extend over two academic years that will average twelve hours per semester.

REDUCTIONS IN TEACHING LOADS

A chair, with the approval of the dean, may approve a reduced teaching load for a faculty member during the academic year with the following conditions:

1. The instructional responsibilities of the department for both on-campus and off-campus classes will be met by the departmental faculty.
2. The departmental advising system, including the mentor relationship, will not be compromised.
3. There will be no added costs to the university in terms of replacement faculty. Reallocations within the college may be utilized.
4. The credit hour production of the department/college will not be diminished.
5. The credit hour production of the department/college will generate at least the F.T.E. faculty positions as provided by the C.H.E. Funding Formula. *
6. Opportunities for release time may be provided for faculty in those departments that are currently over-staffed but have detailed plans (projected retirements, expansion of extended campus offerings, Saturday classes, sharing of faculty with other departments, etc.) for bringing F.T.E. faculty in line with the C.H.E. Funding Formula. The dean of the college will prepare and review such plans with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research prior to approving released time for departments that are over-staffed.

A reduction in teaching load may be approved for such activities as follows:

1. Activities that will strengthen the department and its educational programs such as:
 - a. course and curriculum development
 - b. retraining
 - c. upgrading of skills and knowledge
 - d. recruitment of students
 - e. research related to instructional responsibilities
 - f. special projects

g. writing proposals for extramural funding

* It is recognized that in a very few disciplines, the CHE Funding Formula does not seem to "fit." These disciplines will be identified.

2. Released time to pursue an activity that brings recognition and credit to the individual and the institution. Examples of these activities include:
 - a. research, scholarly, and creative activities
 - b. state, regional, or national professional office
3. Released time to assist units outside of the department of the college.
4. Reduce inequities in teaching loads based on number of students, contact hours, and other responsibilities.

The dean of the college will provide a report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, shortly after the beginning of each semester during the academic year, of the released time approved for faculty in the departments of the college.