

4/11/2022

Evaluation of Expectations for Full-Time Faculty Teaching and Research with Attention to Instructional Capacity Committee

Members:

David Bertolini, Dean, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Canan Bilen-Green, VP, Faculty Affairs and Equity

Igathinathane Cannayen, Associate Professor, Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering

Thomas Dowdell, Chair, Accounting and Information Systems

Jeanette Hoffman, Associate Professor, Education

Jack Rasmussen, Chair, Plant Pathology

Kimberly F. Wallin, Dean, College of Science and Mathematics

Committee Recommendations:

- **Ensure faculty workload equity, transparency, and accountability.** Units should improve workload transparency and clarity for all faculty members. *For unit level interventions, for tracking and improving faculty workload see <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf>*
- **Account for all areas of faculty work**, while covering the core duties (teaching+research+service), such as supervision of teaching assistants, student advising (general, research, thesis), travel to off site teaching locations. *See survey results below for examples of work faculty have reported not receiving credit.*
- **Focus** on making sure **everyone is fulfilling their assigned workload**, especially in teaching. This can reduce reliance on part time academics (PTAs) to find efficiencies and cost savings.
- **Reassign full professors to teach** as many courses and students advising as associate and assistant professors. Savings come from faculty with higher salaries teaching more Student Credit Hours (SCHs).
- **Adjust teaching loads** of those who do not meet non-teaching responsibilities and research productivity expectations. Exclusive outreach activities (e.g., Agricultural Extension Service) will not fall under this category.
- **Reduce to 10%** those with 20% **service load**; reassign service over 10% to teaching or research.
- **Account for** faculty undergraduate and graduate **advising in teaching loads.**
- **Review and implement Huron suggestions**, in particular those listed in this report.

- **Develop an NDSU faculty workload policy** that broadly defines faculty teaching workload criteria in terms of number of courses and SCH taught. Units should be asked to **define department-specific workload expectations** that align with campus-wide expectations.
- **Take into account SCH taught** in course loads.
- Create a new committee to further look into **developing a faculty workload model**. *Three possible criteria/models are included in this report.*

Savings /Opportunities identified in the [Huron Report](#):

- **Evaluate faculty effort expectations** and need for low Credit Hours Produced (CHP) courses in **academic units that generate 50% of their credit hours through 5 or fewer courses** (page 58).
- Adjunct, part-time or administrative instructors amount to an additional 468 individuals teaching courses resulting in an estimated total of approximately \$7.6M for their teaching efforts (page 61).
- If every **FT Faculty member teaching below the average CHP** (358) were **brought up to the average**, NDSU would have the capacity to offer more than 78,000 additional credit hours by FT faculty without increasing expenses (page 61). This move could eliminate 280 PT and save about \$4.8M.
- Consider whether adjustments should be made to **redirect more of full time and tenure-line faculty's workload toward teaching to be able to reduce the need for additional hires to fill in gaps** (page 66).
- **Review supplemental pay policies to ensure that extra compensation is limited to those who have fulfilled their load expectations** (page 66).

Defining Workload - Possible Criteria/Models:

The following possible criteria or models are presented to evaluate the workload through numerical values and calculations.

- 1) Starting point of a typical faculty workload 40% teaching (2/2), 40% research, 20% service

10% effort = 8 hours of work per week

One 3 credit course = 10% effort or 8 hours per week. This consists of contact hours (3 hrs) and 5 hours of outside class time.

- 2) Loosely based on University of Texas at Martinsville. Load based on combination of credits and enrollment:

- "one course" for lecture is 3 credits and 40 students = 0.9995:

index = $((\text{Course.Credits} \times 0.333) + (\text{Enrollments}/40))/2$.

- "one lab" is 1 credit and 25 students = 0.6665:

index = $((\text{Course.Credits} \times 0.333) + (\text{Enrollments}/25))/2$.

- Research is: index = $(0.0666 \times \text{Enrollments}) = 0.0666$ for one student doing research
- Calculated per instructor per semester (semester teaching load)

3) Faculty Effort (or) Performance Index Model

The various contributing factors (direct and inverse) related to faculty effort, that were not captured (based on faculty surveys and interaction) in simpler models should be identified. The workload distribution of the position description and the rank of the faculty members should be considered in developing the effort model.

Teaching: $[\# \text{ credits/yr} \times \text{factor} + \# \text{ students/yr} \times \text{factor}]$ *adjusted to* Teaching load and Faculty rank

Research: $[\# \text{ grants (or) } \$/\text{yr} \times \text{factor} + \# \text{ papers/yr} \times \text{factor} + \# \text{ presentations/yr} \times \text{factor} + \# \text{ students advised/yr} \times \text{factor}]$ *adjusted to* Research load and Faculty rank

Service: $[\# \text{ committees/yr} \times \text{factor} + \# \text{ reviews/yr} \times \text{factor} + \# \text{ volunteer/yr} \times \text{factor}]$ *adjusted to* Service load and Faculty rank

- Above components of workload combined to produce numerical values
- Factors (weights) should be decided – by committee
- Model can be modified
- With the model scales/ranges can be established – Performance ranges
- Formula will help – Faculty compare their Effort or Performance

Faculty Workload Survey Results:

Survey was sent to NDSU Faculty listserv on February 16, 2022. There were 153 responses to the survey.

1) Does your **current position description accurately reflect** your effort in **teaching**?

Yes = 92 (60.1%) No = 61 (39.9%)

2) Does your current **position description accurately reflect** your efforts in **research**?

Yes = 92 (60.5%) No = 60 (39.5%)

3) Does your current **position description accurately reflect** your efforts in **service**?

Yes = 70 (46.1%)

No = 82 (53.9%)

4) If you have advisees assigned to you, where is the **undergraduate advising reflected in your position description?**

Teaching = 54 (35.3%) Research = 2 (1.3%) Service = 24 (15.7%)

Not reflected = 26 (16.9%) Do not advise = 47 (30.7%)

5) What are you doing that you are **not getting credit for in your yearly percent effort?**

Themes from 111 responses (# of comments in parenthesis): **NDSU service** (20); **undergraduate advising** (16); **graduate student advising** (11); **teaching load higher than percent effort** (11); service to the profession (7); administrative (6); clinical work (4); outreach (4); supervising teaching (3); recruiting students (3); teaching prep (3); research during summer (3); independent study (3); faculty mentoring (1); diversity, equity, inclusion work (1); meetings (1); fundraising (1); interdisciplinary work (1); service off campus (1)

6) What is **working well for you regarding your work expectations?**

Themes from 85 responses (# of comments in parenthesis): **flexible expectations among faculty** (17); **teaching** (15); **balanced portfolio** (15); **department/local support/control** (14); overall (8); **nothing/burned out** (8); transparent (5); research (5); appreciated (5); colleagues (3); course load (3); advising (2); NDSU benefits (1); office space (1); academic freedom (1)

7) What is **not working well for you regarding your work expectations?**

Themes from 97 responses (# of comments in parenthesis): **long work hours/weeks** (14); **too much service** (11); **inequitable workloads** (8); lack of local admin support (6); micromanaging dept (6); lack of time (6); too much teaching (3); lack of support for teaching (3); salary (3); no credit for outreach (2); too many meetings (1); upper admin (1); too much advising (1); mentoring graduate students (1)

8) **Suggestions** for the committee.

Themes from 86 responses (# of comments in parenthesis): **equity in workload** (15); **clear workload expectations** (8); don't homogenize (6); class size matters (5); reduce service (3); define '3-credit' course (3); value lecture, non-TT (3); value extension (2); support teaching with graders(1); timing of workload (1); constant budget concerns (1); post-tenure expectations (1); understanding of context (1)

