

Workload Re-allocation: A Special Report to CSU Senate Chairs

Prepared by Faculty Trustee Craig Smith

1. **Overview:** In a draft proposal, the division of Academic Affairs in the Chancellor's office has recommended that we "revisit the 1999-2001 CSU faculty workload study to reconfirm the system-wide move to increased expectations and performance in the area of faculty research and scholarship." We should also "initiate a CSU dialogue on workload balance and reassignment strategies that recognize this realignment of faculty workload."

A. This proposal opens the door to a further liberalization of workload determinations. We need to understand that student contact hours are not the only way to assign faculty workload.

B. The use of the phrase "release time" for instructionally related or other activity should be seen as a misnomer. We do not get release time for advising; our workload is simply reallocated from the classroom to other time consuming activities. It is inappropriate for any unit of the CSU to claim that faculty have lower loads when such calculation fail to take into account other activities for which professors are required to put in time. (Provost calculations for recruitment purposes.)

C. There is nothing in the MOU that precludes giving professors credit for scholarly and creative activity outside of the classroom.

D. We are even less competitive with cohort institution when it comes to workload than we are on salaries.

2. **Unilateral Action:** Many campuses, colleges, divisions and departments have instituted their own practices for generating a more balanced approach to workloads. These include:

A. Reducing SFR to generate more classes per total enrollment. (Check across system.)

B. Double counting classes that enroll twice their SFR or more.

C. Using enrollments in mass lectures to justify smaller classes such as seminars or reallocation for research or creative activity.

D. Increase the unit count for courses; English to 4 units.

E. Increase contact hours for courses; student gets 3 units; but faculty gets 4.5 or 6.

F.

3. **Possible Systemwide Solutions:** Both in negotiations with the CFA and where it can operate outside of the bargaining process, the CSU has options that it can implement to better balance workload.

A. **Three Tracks to Tenure:** The current one size fits all approach to tenure is absurd in a system with over 20,000 faculty. It would make more sense either inside departments or inside colleges to provide at least three possible tracks to tenure to better meet the various needs of our majors. This proposal uses the semester system numbers but could easily be adjusted for quarter system campuses. (To ease committee assignments needs, the service requirement would be the same in each track.

1. Track One might be a high research track which allocated at least one class per semester to research or creative activities. Faculty in this track would be required to teach at least 3 courses or their SFR equivalent in each semester. Expectations

for faculty in this track would need to be clearly articulated as they are now in most RTP documents. For example, faculty in this track might be expected to average one scholarly, juried article a year or a university press book during their probationary period. Faculty who failed to fulfill this expectation could be moved to a more suitable track or not retained.

2. Track Two might be the current tenure track which emphasizes teaching but requires some research or creative activity. Faculty in this track would be required to teach at least 3 courses or their SFR equivalent in each semester.

3. Track Three would be a purely teaching track. While professors in this track would have to maintain teaching competence, they would not have to publish research or to engage in creative activities. They would be required to teach a minimum of 4 courses or their SFR equivalent in each semester. They could be required to teach 5 courses per semester. Colleges or departments might be required to balance these tracks in the following way: any candidate could be hired into Track Two; for every professor hired into Track One, one would have to be hired into Track Three.

This system would better balance workload while enhancing the teaching and research missions of the CSU. Such a system would also facilitate ACR 73 since it would make recruiting easier.

B. Meet Your Target as You See Fit: Instead of being assigned courses to teach, departments would be given specific enrollment targets and allowed to meet these in different ways. The enrollment target for the semester could be determined by multiplying the SFR by four and then by the full-time equivalent number of faculty (FTEF). Thus, if department A had an assigned SFR of 20 and had the equivalent of 12 full-time faculty, their target would be 960. (This can also be done in terms of full-time equivalent students, FTES, for every 15 units you generate, you get credit for one student. So if your assigned target was to generate 300 FTES; the equivalent of 4,500 units, or 1,500 student seats, or 125 students per professor (12 FTEF) per semester). A professor could meet his teaching obligation by teaching one class of 125; two classes of 63; three classes of 42; or four classes of 21. If the department offered several mass lectures, it might be possible to lower work load across the board. In other words, the administration would essentially be telling a department, we don't care how you get to your target – as long as you don't violate the MOU – just get to your target.

Senate Course Releases

	05/06 CRs	06/07 CRs Scenario #1	06/07 CRs Scenario #2
Senate Chair	4	4	4
Vice Chair	0	0	0
Secretary	0	0	0
APC	1	1	1
BLP	1	2	1
FAC	1	1	1
GEC	1	1	1
LATAC	1	1	1
NEAC	1	1	1
PAC	0	1	1
SAC	1	1	1
UCC	1	1	2
	12	14	14
Per each*	4,706	4,918	4,918
Total	56,472	68,852	68,852
Allocation 06/07		70,000	70,000
Difference		1,148	1,148

*06/07 CR cost based on 05/06 amount plus 4% estimated increase