

A Shared Governance Approach to Faculty Workload

Samuel Merritt College

Penny Bamford, PhD, RN

Terry Nordstrom, MA, PT

Arizona School of Health Sciences

AT Still University

Suzanne Brown, MPH, PT

Objectives

- Compare the factors leading to revision of faculty workload standard in one institution to those of the attendees home institution.
- Identify the external factors that contribute to faculty workload as an important issue in higher education.
- Appreciate the critical factors leading to successful implementation of a faculty workload standard and the potential barriers and pitfalls.

Objectives

- Examine a method for implementing a revision of faculty workload standards.
- Examine a method for measuring faculty workload based on contact hours with other methods, e.g. course units.

Samuel Merritt College Profile

- Private, health sciences institution
- ~1100 students on 2 campuses
- Mission

SMC Profile: Programs

- Bachelor's
 - Accelerated BSN
 - BSN
- Master's
 - Nursing: Entry-level MSN, FNP, CRNA, Case Management, post-entry level MSN
 - Physician Assistant
 - Occupational Therapy
- Doctoral
 - Podiatry
 - Physical Therapy

SMC Profile: Faculty

- 69 full-time faculty and 80 part-time
- No tenure system
- Contract Terms
 - One year
 - 2 year
 - 3 year rolling contracts

SMC Profile: Full-time Faculty

- Rank
 - 72% Assistant Professor
 - 12% Associate Professor
 - 16% Professor
- Gender
 - 74% Female
 - 26% Male

SMC Profile: Governance

- Board of Trustees
- Academic Division
 - Academic Vice-President
 - Assistant Academic Vice-President
- Faculty Organization
 - All regular faculty with at least 50% time appointment

SMC Profile: Faculty Organization



Faculty Affairs Committee

- Policies Regarding
 - Academic freedom
 - Faculty rights and responsibilities
 - Faculty appointment, rank, promotion, and evaluation,
 - Faculty development;
- Policies and procedures regarding
 - Faculty personnel matters
 - Salaries and benefits
 - Workload and other working conditions

“Players”

- Faculty Organization
 - Vice-President/Chair of Faculty Affairs
 - Faculty Affairs Committee
- Academic Division
 - Academic Vice-President
 - Assistant Academic Vice-President
- Deans, Chairs and Program Directors
- President
- Board of Trustees
- Internal Consultant
- External Consultant

Problem History

- Faculty
 - Perceived inequity within and across departments
 - Negative impact on faculty contracts
- Academic Division
 - Standardize workload requirements
 - Systematic method to assign and monitor workload

Survey by Faculty Organization

- Rank order of problems by Faculty
 - Workload
 - Salaries
 - Contracting and Faculty Assignments
 - Communication
 - Support for scholarship and teaching
 - Decision-making authority for Deans & Chairs
 - Criteria for promotion
 - Lack of consistency on units for degrees

Response by Faculty Organization

- Motion to examine workload considering teaching, scholarship and service

Academic Division Goal 2002-3

- Equitable faculty workload policy congruent with institutional budget
 - Responsibility
 - AVP
 - AAVP
 - President's Council
 - President
 - Vice-Presidents
 - Board of Trustees

Original AVP Plan

- Identify issues
- Examine current practices
- Compare and benchmark like institutions with consultant and IR
- Review findings and discuss with College Community
- Accept workload measures
- Implement and monitor

New SMC Plan

- Shift from an administrative to a shared governance approach
 - Bensimon, EM and O'Neil, HF (1998) Collaborative Effort to Measure Faculty Work, *Liberal Education*, Fall: 22-31.
- Appointed Workload Task Force

Higher Education Perspectives of Faculty Workload

- Social
- Political
- Economic

Definitions for Faculty Workload

- Number of hours per week
- Number of hours in teaching and instruction
- Number of hours spent on service and scholarship

Meyer, 1998

Shared Governance Process

- Workload Task Force
 - Chair: Chair of Faculty Affairs
 - Faculty Affairs Committee
 - One Faculty Member per School or Department
 - Department Representatives
 - Deans, Chairs and Program Directors
 - Academic Vice-President
 - Assistant Academic Vice-President
 - Internal Consultant (facilitator)
 - Institutional Research

Role of Task Force Chair

- Faculty Member Representing Faculty Interest
- Set Agenda
- Hold Committee Members Accountable
- Challenge Resistances Among Members
- Provide Feedback to Faculty Organization
- Provide Progress and Rationale to Board of Regents and College President

Role of Department Representatives

- Curriculum Review of Required Units
- Consideration of Accrediting and Professional Standards
- Presentation of Units and Rationale for Hours/Unit to Committee
- Critique and Challenge Colleagues

Contributions: Department Representatives

- Greater Understanding of Each Program within the College
- Greater Appreciation and Increase Trust among Colleagues across Departments
- Realities and Truths of Units/FTE's for Various Teaching Modalities

Contributions (Continued)

- Differences in Calculating Actual Number of Hours per Credit:
 - Didactic - Carnegie
 - Lab
 - Clinical
- Endless Justifications

Role of Academic Vice-President

- Provide Academic Administrative Perspective
- Provide Global Perspective of Departmental Curricula
- Challenge and Stretch Thinking

Contributions: AVP

- Trusted Relationship with Committee Representatives
- Experience with the Board of Regents and President of College
- Presence demonstrated commitment and value of the process.

Role of Internal Consultant

- Challenge Assumptions
- Listen Objectively
- Propose Strategies
- Play Devil's Advocate
- Present alternative ways of thinking of obstacles and solutions

Contributions: Internal Consultant

- Provided Outside lens with Institutional Memory
- Provided Business Perspective
- Kept the Group Moving toward Completion of Tasks
- Provided Alternatives and Options

Role of Institutional Research

- Develop Spreadsheets to Test Model
- Develop Formulae
- Data Analysis

Revised Workload Plan

- Appoint Task Force
- Agree on Goals and Plan
- Internal Workload Survey
- External Workload Survey
 - RFP
 - Charge to consultant

External Consultant

- Qualifications & Experience
 - Institutional Assessment
 - Faculty Workload Assessment
 - Higher Education Administration
 - Private sector, teaching focused institutions

External Consultant

- Expectations
 - Review findings of internal study
 - Conduct external study
 - Develop instrument
 - Gather data
 - Analyze data
 - Advise Task Force on Recommendations from Data
 - Meet with Workload Task Force and Faculty

Revised Workload Plan

- Internal Workload Survey
- External Workload Survey
 - RFP
 - Charge to consultant
- Task Force Review Findings and Develop Proposals
- Proposals approved by Faculty Organization and President
- Phase-in any new faculty FTE

Definition of Faculty Workload

- Teaching
- Research & Scholarship
- Service
- Administration

Purpose

- Develop common understanding of workload issues across campus
- Develop common language to analyze and evaluate workload
- Implement fair and equitable workload policy across programs that will support future program development

Goals of Workload Study

- Understand curricula, delivery of teaching & learning and how faculty assigned across departments
- Establish a database to document workload
- Determine if SMC workload is comparable to other Colleges and meets accreditation standards
- Determine teacher/student ratios and whether those are justified
- Bring reasonable equity across programs

Goals (continued)

- Standardize workload assignment for
 - Clinical work
 - Scholarship
 - Grant-supported activity
 - Student research or synthesis projects
 - Teaching load for deans, chairs and directors
 - Teaching load for clinical or curriculum coordinators
- Establish authority for workload decisions at dean, chair and AVP levels

Internal Study Variability

- Full teaching load 10-24 credit hours/9 month

Faculty Workload per Semester by Program

Program	Credit Hours	
	9 Month	12 Month
Undergraduate		
Program A	12	
Graduate		
Program B	9	12
Program C	na	9
Program C	na	11
Program D	9	9
Program F	5.5	5.5
Program G	9	11

Variability Found in Internal Study

- Full teaching load 10-24 credit hours /9 month
- Ratio of clinical hours to credit hours received
- Clinical and lab courses workload weighting (150-200% in nursing to 0% for contract faculty)
- Assigning workload for oversight of precepted clinical courses
- Guest lecturer use, payment and impact on workload

Internal Survey Variability (continued)

- Title and duties of clinical education coordinators
- Assignment of workload for clinical education coordinators
- Title and duties of curriculum coordinators
- Nature of synthesis or capstone experiences, faculty role, and assignment of workload

External Study: Summary

- Scope
- Definitions
- Methods
- Comparison institutions

External Study Summary of Findings

- Institution Information
- Faculty & Student Information
- Teaching Loads
- Institutional Workload Practices
- Clinical Coordination
- Faculty Scholarship & Service

Findings: Institutions

- 35 Participants
- 75% private
- 33% San Francisco Bay Area
- 25% Research mission
- 33% Specialty
- 15% <1000 students; 23% >10,000

Findings: Teaching Loads

- Credit hours/term for full-time faculty
- Consultant concluded
 - Undergraduate courses SMC close to mean of peers
 - Graduate courses SMC was lower than mean of peers

Findings: Workload Practices

- Independent Study
- On-line courses
- Class preparation
- Adjustment by enrollment
- Support staff
- Guest lecturers
- Department chair/director

Findings: Faculty Scholarship & Service

- ~60% did not give credit hours for scholarship or service
- “Expectation” of faculty recognized in performance appraisal
- One day per week for external practice or consultation for pay

Analysis: External Study

- Faults with data collection methodology
 - Asked data on credit hours per term per full-time faculty
 - Did not ask if or how credit hours were adjusted
 - By class type
 - By faculty responsibility
- Difficult to draw conclusions based on aggregate data

Analysis: External Study

- Bias toward finding a standard was not supported
- Most institutions do not have policies
- No consistent standard across institutions, but some consistency in disciplines
- SMC base plan on qualitative decisions within context of
 - Productivity measures
 - Financial accountability
 - Value of service to students

Analysis: External Study

- Need flexible standards
- SMC ratios below peer benchmarks in several areas
- Smaller student-faculty ratios in skills labs & student clinicals in nursing
- Department Chair teach 50% time

Analysis: External Study

- Faculty contact hours per week significantly higher in all types of labs
- Department heads have 50% teaching load at 75% of institutions in survey
- 41% provide workload for scholarship

Assumptions- The “Paradigm Shift”

- Old: Base workload on individual faculty's assigned credit hours
- New: Base workload on # FTE for program
 - “Reasonable” and “Justifiable”
 - Faculty FTE required to execute a successful program w/in acceptable parameters of quality.

Underlying Assumptions

- Reasonable length of program
- Reasonable # total units of program for graduation.

Outcomes

- Programmatic rather than individual workload
- Dept. chairs empowered to distribute workload among faculty according to need and w/in FTE for program
- Honor uniqueness of programs not stipulating inflexible workload rules
- Provide mechanism for cost management

Definition

- # faculty FTE for a program must
- Support achievement of the program's outcomes and objectives
- Be efficient and economic to justify program costs
- Fulfill curriculum design requirements

Implementation

- Workload Task Force Evaluate Two Models
 - Credit hour model
 - Contact hour model

ASHS/ATSU Physical Therapy

- "440 Model"
- Developed in 1995 as a way to seek an equitable workload both within the PT program and among all health professions units in the institution

Basic Assumptions

- Full-time Equivalent = 2080 work hours/yr
- Basic work productivity is assumed to be 66% for white collar workers
- Faculty workload consists of teaching (66%), research (25%), service (19%)
- Teaching is/was the major activity among ASHS faculty when the initial workload policy was developed

Assumptions, continued

- Holidays were taken off the top of FTE hours, but not vacation
- For every hour of instruction, 2 hours of preparation time is needed
 - Prep time is revision of course, assessment development, grading, set-up, etc.
 - An hour of instruction is an hour of instruction, regardless of lecture or lab, team or solo

Therefore, in our institution:

2080 Full Time work hours
- 80 Holiday hours
2000 hours
X .66
1320 Productive work hours/year
680 related activities hours/year

Definitions: Related Activities

- The related activities (in our institution) are considered to include
 - Vacation,
 - Research
 - Service,
 - coffee breaks, gripe sessions,

Definition: Work

- Instructional Hour = 1 contact + 2 prep
 - Full time teaching = 440 instructional hours per 12 month employment
 - “440 Model”
 - Can be adjusted for other major work activities such as funded research, administration, professional service

Non-instructional Work

- Each unit could define other work with Dean's approval.
- Physical Therapy defined as:
 - Clinical Education – 3 instructional hrs/rotation
 - 9 contact hours
 - Thesis Advisement – 8 instructional hrs/student
 - 24 contact hours/student, most done in groups of 2-3

Actual application

- Uses total instructional hours to show need for program faculty
- Dept Chair can assign workload based on total instructional hour need
- Most faculty are in class 6-9 hours per week for 3 of 4 quarters
- Double lab staffing, Clinical and thesis “buy” time

ATSU Annual Program Offerings

- 2997 *instructional* contact hours:
- Residential DPT
 - 54 didactic courses – lecture sections
 - 69 lab sections
 - 17-35 thesis committees
 - 325 clinical placements
- Transitional DPT
 - 28 courses
 - 74 sections
 - 35 terminal projects

- Residential:
 - $2742 \times 3 = 8226 / 440 = 18.7$ FTE
- Transitional
 - $255 \times 3 = 765 / 440 = 1.75$ FTE
- Actual 2005-06
 - 11 FTE
 - 6.0 in adjunct faculty (15 individuals)
 - .5 FTE in support faculty
 - 1 FTE vacant
 - 2 FTE short, faculty overloads

Actual

- Full-time faculty loads vary from 354 – 559 instructional hours
- Using more TA's this year due to large class (61)
- Accounting for vacation (160 hr/yr) is difficult
- Faculty have average tenure at institution of 7 years so efficiencies are being realized in prep time

Adjusting to your setting:

- Agree on productive time and related activities
- Adjust instructional hours and equivalents
- Work from the departmental needs down to individual faculty desires
- Deduct vacations and holidays before determining need (learn from our mistake)

Future

- Trying to adjust downward to meet CAPTE Scholarship Productivity requirements
- We are looking at a "330 model" (variation of 50-25-25) using total hours minus vacation and holidays: this would give us 1840 hours or 990 teaching – 425 service – 425 scholarship

Contact Hour Model

- Full-time teaching load
 - 440 contact hours on 12 month contract
 - 360 contact hours on 9 month contract
- Assumptions
 - 2 hours of preparation per 1 contact hour
 - Contact hour equal across all types of courses

Testing Contact Hour Model

- Comparison
 - Contact Hour Model from Arizona School of Health Sciences
 - Credit Hour Model
- Derive FTE

Assumptions to Test Model

- Current program enrollment
- Current faculty:student ratios by course type
- Current curriculum

Class Typology

Type	Faculty:Student Ratio
Lecture	Cohort class
Basic Science Lab	1:20
Clinical Skills Lab	1:12
Supervised Clinicals	1:8 to 12 (variable)
Assessment labs & PBL Seminars	1:8
Precepted Clinicals	(# students) x (# rotations) x (3 hours)

Precepted Clinical Example

- 3 instructional hours per student per clinical rotation
 - 40 students
 - X 4 clinical rotations during program
 - X 3 hours per student
 - 480 hours
 - $480/440 = 1.1$ FTE

Contact Hours per Course

- Course Type
- Enrollment
- Course contact hours in semester

Examples

Course #	Type	Enroll	# Sxns	Contact Hr/wk	Total
721	Skill	36	3 (1:12)	5	240 (15 x 16)
722	Lecture	36	1 (cohort)	3	48 (3 x 16)
723	Science Lab	36	2 (1:20)	9	288 (18 x 16)

Contact Hour Model Positive Factors

- Removed credit hour from workload discussion
- Straightforward concept
- Provided flexibility to program chairs and faculty
- “Close fit” to current practice in most programs

Contact Hour Model Negative Factors

- Larger impact on faculty teaching 1^o lecture courses
- Assumes same prep time per contact hour regardless of course type
- Adjunct faculty contracts based on credit hour assignment
- Faculty workload disassociated from student credit hours

Applying the model in PT @ SMC

- Faculty Contact Hours Varies 365 to 475
- 8 Contact Hours per Faculty for Case Report Advisement
- Course coordinator allocation

Faculty Time

	Hours/Yr	Hours/Wk
Contact Hours	440	8.5
Teaching preparation	880	17.0
Scholarship & Service	552	10.5
Vacation/Holiday	208	4

Comparisons

	% Faculty Time Teaching
Meyer	47.3 to 76%
CAPTE Annual Accreditation Report	50.8% (Mean, all programs)
SMC/ASHS Model	63% (440+880)/2080

Comparisons

	Contact Hours per Week
AAUP	Undergraduate 9-12 Graduate 6-9
Meyer	Research 6.6 Doctoral 8 Comprehensive 10.5
SMC/ASHS	8.5

Current Status Lessons Learned

Role of College President

Ask Questions – Raise Issues

- Is Model Truly Equitable?
- Is there a Reasonable Basis for Equity?
- Is the Model Affordable Now and in the Future?
- Is the Model Simple Enough to Administer?
- Does the Model Provide Flexibility and Simplify the Workload Allocation?

President's Questions and Issues Continued

- How Does the Model Assure the Right Mix of Teaching - Scholarship – Service?
- How Are we Assured that We can Measure Scholarship and Service Outcomes with a Contact Hour Model?
- Curricular Changes Drive the Contact Hours; Contact Hours Translate to FTE's.

Perceptions and Realities Applying Model Across Departments

- Nursing Faculty believed they worked the hardest and were paid the least.
- Under tones of “if Nursing would only”, or Nursing is always the problem”.
- Nursing faced the greatest challenge; most expensive program to implement with the lowest profit margin.

Lessons Learned

- Difference in definitions describing classroom and clinical teaching.
- Semantic dialogue delayed and distracted the process.
- Resistance to looking outside the box or changing approaches to clinical teaching in Nursing, Podiatry and Physician Assistant.

Lessons Learned

- Frequent repetition of key message to faculty built support
 - Control of workload shifting to department
 - Equitable system
 - Improvement over old system
- Participation from each department provided willingness to change and compromise

Lessons Learned

- Best fit of the model seemed to be with PT and OT.
- Absent or unprepared Department Chairs on day to present.
- Wearing down over time and the sense of just finishing allowed for consensus of definitions.

Lessons Learned

- One person from each department completed the curriculum review of contact hours.
- Genuine support, collegiality and effort to complete the task.
- Departments knew they would face a decrease in FTE's with the model.

Next Steps

- Workload & Salary
 - Shift from teaching paradigm
 - To student learning paradigm
- Workload and Salary are foundational to cultural change

References

- Bensimon, EM and O'Neil, HF (1998) Collaborative effort to measure faculty work, *Liberal Education*, Fall: 22-31.
- Meyer, K (1998) Faculty workload studies: Perspectives, needs and future directions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Ed Report. volume 26, no 1. Washington, DC.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.