

# Faculty Workload Task Force Report

The Senate Workload Task Force has been charged with investigating workload issues that faculty at Fresno State face. More specifically, our charge says:

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate hereby appoints a task force to research and provide guidance to the Senate on ways to address all faculty workload issues. This task force shall take into account different workload conditions in Schools / Colleges, departments, and programs. Tasks to be examined that affect faculty workload may include, but are not limited to research, scholarship, and creative activities, service, advising, supervision, course mode and level (from individual instruction to large classes), etc., noting the increasing importance research plays in undergraduate education.

The Task Force shall investigate and make recommendations regarding the workload implications of research, scholarship, and creative activities conducted by faculty, as well as service, that may not be fully accounted for in the standard 15 WTU workload assignment per semester. Any recommendations may include proposed revisions to APM 337 Faculty Workloads: Policies and Procedures, APM 325 Policy on Retention and Tenure, and APM 324 Policy on Probationary Plans and Faculty Mentoring, as necessary. Any recommendations should be aligned with the strategic goals of the university and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Task Force should submit its recommendations to the Senate at large by December 15, 2017. I am asking Dr. John Karr, as the senator who introduced the resolution calling for this task force, to convene the first meeting of the group, at which you should elect a chair and proceed with the work described in this charge.”

The task force was assembled attempting to get a wide spectrum of faculty from various University bodies, so it had people having different viewpoints. Our membership is as follows:

- From the Academic Senate at-large:  
John Karr (Music)  
Tamás Forgács (Mathematics)
- Appointed by the Senate Personnel Committee:  
Brian Tsukimura (Biology)  
The Nguyen (Mechanical Engineering)
- Appointed by the University Budget Committee:  
Robert Maldonado (Philosophy)  
Mathieu Richaud (Earth and Environmental Sciences)
- Appointed by Senate Executive Committee:  
Qiao-Hong Chen (Chemistry)  
Oscar Vega (Mathematics)
- CFA Representative:  
Melissa Gibson (Theatre Arts)

The task force elected Dr. Oscar Vega as its chair.

The task force met once at the end of the Spring 2017 semester, and four times during the Fall of 2017 (09/01, 09/ 26, 11/03, and 12/02). Most members of the task force attended at least three of the meetings.

We (the task force) looked for campus issues, and possible solutions; we did not look at system-wide issues. We realize that most of the issues we address have budgetary repercussions and constraints, thus we consider this report as a list of suggestions that will need to be evaluated, and studied by another body to assess their implementation.

Given the importance workload has in the academic life of our institution, we hope that the Academic Senate is able to discuss all the issues that we brought up in this report, and that it can treat the discussion regarding the existence of these issues separately from the discussion about the possible solutions suggested by this report.

Since our task force was not representative of all the colleges in our campus, we consulted with Faculty, Chairs and Deans from all colleges. Their opinions were considered at the time of writing of this report; a summary of the interviews with all the Deans/Associate Deans may be found at the end of this document, under Supplementary Documents.

We have broken the comments on workload given by our colleagues, and our suggestions for solutions to be explored by the Senate, into two main topics.

1. Large-enrollment classes, TAs, workload distribution in departments, etc.
2. Scholarly, Service, and Teaching tracks for faculty.

We first describe each of these issues separately. Then we give recommendations for each one of them. Overlapping issues will be touched upon several times in this document. Finally, although some of the issues may be specific to certain Colleges, they do point at important aspects of this discussions and hence merit inclusion in this report.

## **1 Large-enrollment classes, TAs, workload distribution in departments, etc.**

Several of the issues mentioned here may require actions by a supportive Chair/Dean, however, some rules in the APMs quoted could be modified to make Chairs/Deans' decisions easier on them.

1. We call for a more reasonable, and consistent, assigning of WTUs for independent study research projects and thesis/project mentoring. Enforcing of University rules regarding this issue is a must.

**Suggestion:** Undergraduate mentoring = 0.5 WTU per **student/project** per semester and graduate mentoring = 1 WTU per **student/project** per semester. There should be a cap of 3 WTUs per semester to the time assigned for student supervision. Whether the assigned time is awarded per student or per project should be left to each College to decide. Also, in case that projects are used for this purpose, the college should decide whether the assigned time would depend on the size of the project (e.g. regular project = 0.5 WTU but large projects/many students = 1 WTU). Colleges would need to find appropriate course classifications for the various possibilities described above. For example, there are course classifications already granting 0.5 WTUs for working with undergraduate students, 1 WTU for working in a large project with students may not be in the books yet.

We realize that enforcing assigned time may be difficult for Chairs, as many times students register for independent/research projects too close to the beginning of the semester, when the schedule for the upcoming semester has already been decided. We suggest that Chairs should try to accommodate teaching schedules in favor of the faculty in the case the faculty gets students after the schedule has been designed. It may be that the Chair will need to compensate in the Spring semester to get faculty to 24 units for the AY. The chair should consider the history of that specific faculty, in terms of advising, at the time of designing the schedule for all semesters, so they can avoid the schedule conflict mentioned above. We believe that it would be good to be able to 'save' units earned by student supervision to carry from Spring to Fall semesters to, then again,

solve problems like the one described above.

2. There is a need for more graders and TAs assigned per class, specifically large ones. If the class is too large (see next item as well), one grader may not be enough. For example, for GE courses, students are supposed to receive meaningful feedback from their instructors in their writings.

**Suggestion:** A TA/grader (given appropriate rubrics) could be trained to give feedback that would be of the same quality as that given by the instructor of record. We are not asking for the creation of new rules, but for the support necessary to implement existing ones. For example, our GE Writing rules

<http://fresnostate.edu/academics/oie/documents/geresources/GE%20Writing%20Requirements%202012.doc>

stipulate that this training of TAs is allowed. There are examples of successful existing TA training programs on campus, for example, Chemistry and Mathematics train their TAs who are assigned to lower division courses. However, there are still open questions, such as: Who does the training? It makes sense, that if a TA is assisting a specific faculty member then the TA should, at least, coordinate with such faculty member; maybe the TA would need to be trained by their supervisor. Since it takes time to train a TA effectively, maybe we should assign time for training, and coordinating, TAs/graders.

3. Some large and very large classes (120+ students) require faculty to grade, provide feedback, and grade re-submissions of essays. It is not possible to provide meaningful comments and grades in a reasonable time, especially for faculty that teach several sections of said classes. This affects student success. The heavy teaching workload encourages that less work be assigned to students (because it takes time to grade), and that classes become progressively easier and easier, ultimately eroding the quality of a Fresno State education.

**Suggestion:** Waive the essay requirements for large and very large classes or provide a reasonable number of TAs for each section for the grading of said essays (see previous item). APM 337 says

For classes with census date enrollment of between 75 and 120 and exceptional workload, a graduate assistant or student assistant may be allocated.

We suggest that “may” is replaced by “should/must”. It is expected that the assignment of a TA to a (large) class will encourage instructors to assess in ways that would, otherwise, be too much work to grade. Moreover, in order to encourage assessment of students that is meaningful, but that require very heavy grading, we recommend that a grader is assigned for every 40 students in a class. We encourage Chairs/Deans to consider assigning graders for classes with enrollment near the ‘benchmarks’ (40 - 80 - 120) as if these had 40-80-120 students.

4. APM 337 says

For classes with census date enrollment of over 120, a graduate assistant, a student assistant, or an additional 3 WTU may be assigned.

**Suggestion:** Change the language from “may be assigned” to “should/must be assigned”. This would, for example, make classes with more than 120 students to count for 6 WTUs for the instructor. Grading issues in these large classes were discussed in the previous item. We would like to suggest that the increase in the count of WTUs for a large class should be paired with, for example, a request that the exams given in the class are written, not multiple choice, or that assessment of students’ learning is done in ways that match the extra assignment of WTUs for the class.

5. Finally, better planning and/or willingness to cooperate from Chairs could reduce the workload of faculty without needing any extra resources. For example:

- Reduce the number of preparations per faculty (in the same semester). This would reduce preparation time and thus help with heavy teaching loads.
- Chairs should strive to balance committee work distribution. Just keeping count on the number of committees per faculty does not guarantee an equal and fair workload distribution in departmental service. Chairs should consider faculty commitments in College or University service when populating department committees. Guidelines will need to be created, as just counting the number of committees faculty are members of does not really measure the workload each faculty had in terms of service.

**Unsolved problems and possible issues arising from our suggestions.**

- Funding for TAs, extra WTUs for large classes, and for WTUs awarded for student supervision.
- The accurate and fair counting of WTUs for student supervision is complex. How late students register for independent studies/research may make impossible for a Chair to be able to modify faculty’s schedule on time. Also, assigned time for supervision might create overloads for faculty, and thus Deans/Chairs/Faculty may not be willing to engage in these types of activities. Finally, for a department that has only 3-unit courses, to assign, say, one WTU for supervision to a faculty member makes impossible to get a WTU count for that AY equal to 24. We suggest that WTUs obtained from student supervision can be accumulated across AYs until they can be used fairly and effectively without creating any of the issues mentioned here.
- Both the reduction of preparations per faculty and the fair distribution of service/committee work depends largely on the willingness of the Department Chair. A complete cooperation from Chairs would be easier to be obtained if some guidelines were provided to them, so these actions have the same effect in all departments.

**2 Scholarly, Service, and Teaching tracks for faculty.**

One of the topics that has naturally come up in our discussions has been that of the need of counting research/scholarly activities as part of the standard faculty workload. Currently, APM 337 (which deals with faculty workload) does not mention research as part of faculty workload; it says:

**I. Definition of Faculty Workload**  
 The normal workload of a full-time faculty member consists of two components:

- A) 12 weighted teaching units (WTU) of direct instructional assignments, including classroom and laboratory instruction and instructional supervision (such as student thesis, project or intern supervision) equivalent to 36 hours per week, and
- B) 3 WTU equivalencies of indirect instructional activity such as student advisement, curriculum development and improvements, and committee assignments (4 to 9 hours per week).

On the other hand, article 20.1a of the Collective Bargaining Agreement says:

**20.1 a.** The primary professional responsibilities of instructional faculty members are: teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession and to the community.

It is immediate to see that there is a clear discrepancy between these two documents. Moreover, in appendix B of APM 337 categories are given for which extra WTUs may be assigned, but none of these categories involve research, the only usage of the word research is in the following context

A faculty member may be given assigned time for documented research evaluations which are demonstrably related to the instructional functions and programs of the college.

In contrast, CBA 20.3b explicitly says that research, scholarly and creative activity should be taken into account in workload.

**20.3b.** In the assignment of workload, consideration shall be given at least to the following factors: graduate instruction; online instruction; activity classes; laboratory courses; supervision; distance learning; sports; and directed study. Consideration for adjustments in workload shall be given to at least the following: class size/number of students; course and curricular redesign; preparation for substantive changes in instructional methods, including development of online and hybrid courses; **research, scholarly, and creative activities [our emphasis]**; advising; student teacher supervision; thesis supervision; supervision of fieldwork; service learning; student success initiatives; assessment and accreditation activities; and service on department, college, or University committees.

Our recommendation for this issue is to decrease the teaching load for all faculty to 9 WTUs per semester and to create ‘tracks’ for faculty: Scholarly, Teaching, and Service. The first and the third tracks would require exceptional levels of research and exceptional levels of service from the faculty to be in them (respectively); faculty in the teaching track will see their teaching load increased to 12 WTUs per semester. Departments would be tasked to design ‘probationary plans’ for each of these tracks for incoming faculty, and also to be used to assess the progress of any given faculty member in the track they chose. Hence, these probationary plans would be used as a set of standards for each of the tracks. Assuming these standards, we give a rough description of these tracks follows:

1. **Scholarly track.** 9-9 teaching load, and significant research/scholarly work and grant activity. Good teaching, standard service.
2. **Service track.** 9-9 teaching load and significant service. Good teaching, standard scholarly work.
3. **Teaching track.** 12-12 teaching load, and standard scholarly work and service. Exceptional care about teaching and teaching-related issues.

There are CSU campuses already operating under this model, in regards to scholarly work; San Diego State and San Francisco State are two notable examples. We believe that moving Fresno State in the direction of these high-profile campuses would be of enormous benefit to Fresno State’s students, faculty and administrators.

We would like to remark on the fact that the suggested tracks do not imply/assume that faculty will choose their track and simply focus on its main core activity (e.g., research, service, or teaching) at the expense of the other two. Indeed, we strongly believe that a minimum of activity on all three fronts is necessary for all faculty to maintain breadth, and we would support a said minimum on each of these three areas be determined by the home department for faculty at that rank (Assistant, Associate, Full).

There are several points to consider to implement such a recommendation. An obvious one is budgetary, for which another committee/task force would need to be formed. We have thoroughly discussed other issues regarding this recommendation; a summary of these discussions follows.

- Several activities that fall into Service are described in APM 337 as part of the 3 WTUs of workload granted besides our 12 teaching WTUs. Hence, ‘exceptional levels of service’ would have to be measured against these already assigned units for service. Also, there are several activities on campus that would qualify as ‘exceptional levels of service’; several of these already have assigned time for performing them (e.g. Department Chair, Graduate Coordinator, Chair of Standing Committees, etc.). Hence, we see the Service Track as an extension of these already-in-place situations and of already-in-place programs, such as Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students, which was active in the Academic Years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016

[https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/facultyaffairs/documents/ESAT\\_Application.pdf](https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/facultyaffairs/documents/ESAT_Application.pdf)

Hence, we suggest to enforce the list in appendix B of APM 337 to help justify some of the assigned times for the Service track.

- The (existing) advising centers should be used to alleviate faculty workload more than they do now. A possible way to increase their potential would be to have faculty in the Service Track spend some time at these

centers.

- Performance in each of the tracks will have to be evaluated. As mentioned before, departments will need to come up with a set of standards, which would also be used as a template for probationary plans for the various tracks. We decided against a University-wide standard because comparing the ‘worth’ of an annual musical performance to a peer-reviewed scientific article was deemed unrealistic. Hence, we strongly feel that departments are best positioned to evaluate what merits to be considered exceptional in a given discipline.
- Note that evaluation of faculty in the three tracks would mean campus reviews of faculty in between promotions, and/or after promotion to full professor.
- RSCAs are currently used as a way to support Scholarly activities on campus. What we are suggesting for the Scholarly track is to have something similar to a 3-year-long RSCA (i.e. the average length of an NSF grant); this extended period of time would be necessary to accomplish long-term, more ambitious, projects. However, we believe that some RSCAs should be still be available for, for example, support summer projects in which faculty need to leave town, or for faculty who may want to get into the Scholarly Track and may need a stepping stone to propose a competitive Scholarly Track proposal, etc.
- Depending on how popular the scholarly and service track are, we may need to have special faculty searches looking for people who wish to be in the teaching track. Besides this specific point, we believe that if we hired people to specific tracks, then we would be able to maintain campus balance among the tracks.
- We believe that release time due to student supervision should be considered separately from the reduced teaching load for faculty in the scholarly track.
- It is expected that faculty in the Scholarly track will involve students in their activities. We believe that the formation of students is an important part of Fresno State’s mission. Thus those who are engaged in scholarly work should address this part of a student’s formation.
- We realize that by decreasing the teaching load of certain faculty, utilizing other (e.g. external) sources of support may lead to faculty not teaching any classes. Given that Fresno State’s main mission is to educate students, we do not consider this an acceptable situation. We propose that all faculty should teach at least one course per semester.

During the time this task force was active, there was a Provost task force working on similar issues. It had been charged to look at Research and Graduate Studies. Dr. Vega was a member of both task forces; given his double-membership, we learned that the Research task force was also looking into decreasing the teaching load of research-active faculty.

It was suggested by Dean Marshall (who co-chaired the Research task force) that during Spring 2018, we ask Deans for estimates about the number of research-active faculty in their colleges, and then about the cost of implementing a reduction of 3 WTUs in the teaching load of research-active faculty (in their colleges). The data gathered this way is in the two tables below. The first table summarizes the money needed to support research-active faculty, monthly and annually, the second table gives the precise number of estimated research-active faculty per college, the percentage of them per college, the annual cost, and then the backfill rate cost of supporting these faculty. All these expenses would need to be taken into account in Fresno State’s annual budget. Note that the difference between the annual cost and the backfill rate cost would need to be, partially or totally, accounted for in each college’s annual budget.

College	Monthly Salary		Annual Salary		Value of 3 WTUs
	Active	Not Active	Active	Not Active	Active
CAH	875932	181629	10511184	2179548	2102237
CHHS	467666	142832	5611992	1713984	1122398
COSS	109293	480830	1311516	5769960	262303
CSB	554411	62006	6652932	744072	1330586
CSM	457979	305866	5495748	3670392	1099150
JCAST	228609	166846	2743308	2002152	548662
KSOEHD	400528	936481	4806336	11237772	961267
LCOE	319522	0	3834264	0	766853
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$3,413,940</b>	<b>\$2,276,490</b>	<b>\$40,967,280</b>	<b>\$27,317,880</b>	<b>\$8,193,456</b>

College	Number	Percentage	Annual Salary	Backfill
CAH	119	85%	2102237	1358028
CHHS	63	79%	1122398	718956
COSS	17	20%	262303	194004
CSB	57	90%	1330586	650484
CSM	65	63%	1099150	741780
JCAST	33	65%	548662	376596
KSOEHD	57	23%	961267	650484
LCOE	40	100%	766853	456480
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>\$8,193,456</b>	<b>\$5,146,812</b>

**Unsolved problems and possible issues arising from our suggestions.**

- Funding for the reduced teaching load for the Service and the Scholarly Tracks.
- Application and evaluation (what does it take to be in any given track?) of faculty in the different tracks.
- What if a faculty member wants to switch tracks?
- When would faculty have to decide what track they want to join?
- How to achieve a balance per department/college of faculty in the different tracks?
- It can be extrapolated from our interviews with the Deans (see Supporting Documents) that some of our proposals may not work as intended in some colleges, given the present institutional culture. Of course, a Dean's opinion may not represent the opinion of the faculty in their college but still, we believe that some 'wiggle room' should be given so colleges can implement our suggestions in the best way they see possible. For example, it was suggested that we should allow faculty to get a 'stipend for research' instead of time to do Scholarly work.

We offer this report to the Senate with hopes that it will be taken as a laundry list of issues that our University should take a closer look at, and as a source of ideas that should be discussed and followed up in the near future. We are aware that our proposals need to be evaluated further and studied to see how they can be implemented.

## SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

We interviewed Deans and/or Associate Deans of all the Colleges at Fresno State to learn their opinion about workload in their colleges. We include these here for a different perspective, that may or may not coincide with the majority of the faculty in their colleges. We also interviewed a Department Chair at San Francisco State University who actively participated in the transition process that eventually took SFSU to have a 9-9 teaching load for Research Active Faculty. These are rough, barely edited drafts.

### **Notes on the interview with Michelle DenBeste (Dean), College of Social Sciences**

Social Sciences has an issue with classroom space, and hence can't offer too many large lecture classes. The class that has 280 enrollment gives the instructor a full 12 WTUs. Classes ranging from 100-160 in enrollment come with 6 WTUs, and on the top end also with a grader (dean's discretionary funds pay for it). It's these classes that are a problem because they do not pay for themselves in the current budget model. She would like to see a campus-wide uniform role for TAs, with central funding and equal distribution to colleges based on need. Social Sciences discourages 190s and 198s, and does NOT give any WTUs to faculty directing these. They also do not give WTUs to faculty directing 290 and 299, but she is working on changing that. Most of undergraduate research happens within the framework of a course. Since their classes are all 3 units, it would actually be a nightmare if she had to assign WTUs to these independent study type courses. She'd have to keep track of how many of these a faculty does, and then give a 3WTU release after say 5 or 6. Could be a problem if there is a change in the dean's office, or if a faculty does 3 or 4. The funding for giving WTUs to 290s and 298 is coming from student enrollment, and development.

As far as research release time is concerned, Social Sciences would need central funding for systematic implementation. For the past 5-7 years they had their RSCA funded entirely by carryover money. An annual 100K from central budget would solve this problem entirely, and fund all the requested release time for research in the college. She expressed that the biggest problem they face is the class enrollment caps being at 45. That is way too many students in a section, and prevents faculty from teaching the way they feel would best serve the student needs. Such class sizes are a product of the current budget model, which would have to change. Also, academic affairs needs to get a bigger piece of the overall budget (perhaps reduce student affairs' share).

### **Notes on the interview with Saúl Jiménez-Sandoval (Dean) and Honora Chapman (Associate Dean), College of Arts and Humanities.**

Nora Chapman did respond to the ideas we've been throwing around. Here is her take: The CAH Dean voice genuine support for looking into and alleviating faculty workload.

There aren't enough large classrooms to accommodate enough large-enrollment classes to make a substantial difference in terms of reducing Wtu to the 9+3+3 model like San Francisco State. (Though opening NG 118 has helped a bit).

Thesis supervision overload release time could be passed around in a department with a release each semester on rotation; History does this.

One question: would all the Provost's RSCA money be repurposed towards partially funding these research releases, and then people would only have RSCA awards available from the Chancellor's office (unless their college has mega bucks, as some do)? This kind of change will have budget implications for the Provost, but the psychic and financial cost of losing people is also large.

As for the 3 WTUs for 'excessive servicer': it better be really extraordinary and time-consuming, since many already get time for service.

On board with 'tracks', but details are needed with the review; they suggest a five-year review. There is a need to set standards about how to deal with TAs because department may get abusive with their TAs. similar thing with requirements for research, as some colleges may be more demanding than others. Need general guidelines



and give some wiggle room for colleges to decide details.

In a follow up discussion, Assoc. Dean Nora Chapman did come out in favor of a 3-3 teaching load suggesting that all university RSCA money be devoted to supporting this. From her point of view this means everyone teaches 3 classes, even if they may be 4 unit classes (unless they are 6 unit mega-classes), so obviously this would represent a significant change to several departments' curricular structure. This would be a step toward leveling the playing field in terms of true workload; currently, inequity in workload is clearly reflected in comparing RTP binders, and at the level of full professors as well, though less documented.

Dean Jiménez did reply later on. Here is what he said.

#### *Workload Issues*

What are the workload issues in your college? What suggestions do you have for changes that would alleviate problems your college encounters with workload? What are the roadblocks to meeting these challenges?

The challenges are the following:

Each year, more responsibilities are added to Probationary Plans. When I arrived as an assistant professor, the publication requirement had just been implemented, and this meant that I was responsible for two articles to get promoted to associate. There was a basic requirement for service (department, college and university, plus one community service event). Now, the requirements are long, and the faculty member has to keep track of the checklist. I don't mind diversifying our contributions, but these added responsibilities have been given to the faculty while their teaching responsibilities have stayed the same. Now, we're a teaching focused institution with research highly encouraged, but with the current 4/4 load, this is a daunting task. The mission and vision of the CSU has changed over the years, while faculty workload in the classroom[...].

*Large Enrollment Classes: For workload, faculty are assigned extra WTU, TA's or graders. What are the challenges to increasing these offerings?*

The challenge has always been this: To provide a quality education in the Arts and Humanities while keeping the workload issue within the normal bounds. Currently, we have an online class that is taught by a single instructor, with almost 1,000 students - Music 9. We spend approximately 24K on student assistants that help the instructor keep it all under control. The current budget formula, though, is not prorated beyond 240 students. So, the only added benefit of this class is the revenue we generate by the FTES (which is minimal). The budget formula does not properly incentivize the faculty or colleges to offer such classes, as the resources necessary to teaching large classes are not overly beneficial to a college, and as the workload for a faculty will be tremendous. We don't technically have graders; the students cannot grade for the professor, as the professor has to do all the grading - based on current policy.

*Thesis supervision: problems with actually accounting for the amount of work these take? What are the challenges to giving more WTU for supervision?*

The main challenge is the a professor cannot bank the supervision of theses from one academic year to the next.

*Reduce the teaching load by 3 WTU to account for research/creative activity; thus, research would automatically become built in to the normal workload. Is this feasible?*

This is not feasible based on the current formula, since all professors generate their salary when they teach their classes. If a professor is not teaching one of her/his classes, the formula does not account for income that will supplement this 'missing' class. The formula is based on a 12 WTU per professor, so that 24 WTUs generate the annual salary of the person. If some of these WTUs are missing from lack of classroom teaching, the college is not funded for the specific salary of the professor.

*The Committee looked at the model at San Francisco State which reduced teaching loads a few years ago. So instead of 15 WTU divided into 12WTU teaching and 3 WTU service, the new model is 9+3+3 with 3 WTU given for research. This was done by increasing class sizes. The workload selling point is that it was better for*

*attracting faculty who are especially interested in research but who leave b/c the teaching load is too high. The argument for the mission of the CSU is that active research enhances teaching and keeps the teaching up to date; and some kinds of research can directly involve students.*

This would work in some disciplines, and not in others. The Arts, for the most part, do not have the capacity to increase class sizes; a professor in music cannot teach a studio class with more than one student, or a ceramic studio or painting class can only accommodate a certain amount of students. Likewise, in the humanities, a writing class, language instruction, or upper-division literature class will suffer greatly if the enrollments are increased. The disciplines of the college are successful in impacting our students positively because the instructors personally interact with the students; this is at the core of both the Arts and Humanities departments. We have done our best to increase enrollments in all areas that could adapt to this increase.

*Regularize the 3 WTU given for 'exceptional service' to a regular and on-going thing for those service-oriented faculty.*

A clearly worded document would have to be drafted as to what 'exceptional service' means. Most professors are involved in various committees, and serve in many levels of university and college committees. What parameter would constitute exceptional? A collection of committees that requires more than 6 hours per week? Very few will qualify for this.

*These 2 items above begin to suggest faculty moving into 'tracks' that emphasize one area of Teaching, Scholarship, Service over the others. This can screw with the tenure and promotion process but on the other hand it also recognizes faculty for the extra energy they do put into these areas: we know there are 'service' types and 'research' types, etc.*

Yes, though, once you give a faculty member release time for service or for extra publications, that in itself already provides the time needed to fulfill such responsibilities, and should not affect the rest of the probationary plan; we can't give release time for responsibilities and then reduce the requirements of the probationary plan; it's either one or the other.

#### **Notes on the interview with Ram Nunna (Dean), Lyles College of Engineering.**

He said that the college doesn't have the real power to control the workload. Every faculty is assigned with 12 WTUs teaching units per semester for the college to get paid in full. Anytime the faculty teaches less, the college will have to supplement the difference. So, it boils down to the money again.

The LCOE has recently been able to obtain some funding that can provide faculty assigned time to do 'other things'. However, faculty have to apply for the assigned times. To make it more structured, 2 policies have been proposed by the Dean and a committee from LCOE to account for research, project and independent study supervision. Dean Nunna supports providing assigned time for faculty to do 'other things', but it has to base on merits. Reducing number of teaching units without clear guidelines may not motivate some faculty to do research or scholarly work.

Dean Nunna also supports looking at having large class for lower division courses, but ONLY if the courses, he emphasizes, have mandatory recitation (or supplementary) sessions. This is to make sure students have enough interaction to understand the materials in depth. This surely needs more TA's and graders. However, there should be sufficient number of graduate students now in LCOE to do the jobs.

#### **Notes on the interview with Sandra Witte (Dean), Jordan College of Agricultural Sciences and Technology.**

JCAST does not have a lot of graduate programs so the issue of supervision load (290/299) is non-existent for the most part. They also discourage undergraduate independent studies because of past misuse (covering material that was part of a course). They have internships instead, which is causing reverse workload problems, inasmuch as faculty are getting WTUs for courses in which students are doing internships at companies. So faculty do not do the work but get the WTUs at times. They have several lab intensive courses, for which the WTU counts can be weird in any given semester, but things usually even out over the academic year (to get to

24 units). The independent study supervision that does occur, faculty volunteer their time. Dean Witte is not supportive of overload, and the college has a problem of finding qualified replacement faculty for anyone who would get release for anything (in place of teaching).

Largest capacity classroom they have is 105, so the 120+ doesn't come into play, but the dean's office funds TAs for every course with enrollment over 50 (about 6-8 per semester).

The Dean is very much in favor for compensating faculty for the work they do, so if they do research, they should get time to do it in order to avoid overload. Reducing JACST teaching to 9 WTU per semester would require 'payment' for about 160 WTUs a semester. One way to reduce this would be to do streams (teaching, research, service) that way faculty who don't want to do research can concentrate on teaching. Dean Witte advocates for accountability in all streams. In particular, it's easy to assess whether one's research is getting done, and include that in the expectations, something similar should be implemented for the teaching and service streams. In particular, post tenure and post promotion review for faculty should be taken seriously and implemented seriously in order for these streams to be equitable.

At this time JCAST faculty is encouraged to apply for summer pay instead of course releases because they don't have qualified replacement faculty. They actually cap course release per semester at 6WTUs for this reason. Dean Witte also said that JCAST is in a special situation in terms of funding with the Jordan endowment, and also the state funded research centers.

#### **Notes on the interview with Donald Stengel (Associate Dean), Craig College of Business**

Up until about ten years ago, research-active Faculty at CSB transitioned from teaching 12WTUs to 9WTUs. The process started because of pressure put over the college by accreditors; they demanded that faculty needed to be active in publishing (they even ask for well-ranked journals). Faculty should publish at least two articles in five years in good journals (they look at acceptance rate and the Australian ranking of journals, for example. No predatory journals). CSB is able to pay for this assigned time by having several 40+ classes and by using their endowment. They enforce the demands required to get the assigned time ruthlessly; there is a yearly evaluation of research-active faculty. If faculty do not satisfy what this 'research tracks' needs, they are back to teach 12 WTUs.

They carry the yearly evaluation when they write their reports to Deans and Provost. After five years they have to put all this together to report to the accreditation organizations.

CSB would be supportive for doing this campus-wide; the Associate Dean said that once it gets in place faculty likes it and since rules are clear then everybody knows where they are, etc. he said that even full professor came on board, because they were inviting faculty to do research with a carrot and not the stick.

When asked about how 'difficult' is to publish two articles in five years, the AD said that they ask for three papers in six years for tenure, so it does not mean anything beyond the demands required to get tenure.

Regarding large sections. CSM has the second highest student to faculty ratio on campus, and so large sections are an issue. The AD said that the majority of their graduate students are commuters, and so even if they could get TAs to help with the grading they would not be able to get students interested in getting those jobs (they already have better-paid jobs). He said that they justify the heavy grading with the research assigned time. It is not the same issue but it definitely helps to grade a lot of HW if you are teaching only 9 WTUs.

The AD warned us against forgetting our mission, which is largely teaching, when we search for more support for research.

#### **Notes on the interview with Christopher Meyer (Dean) and Alam Hasson (Associate Dean), College of Science and Mathematics.**

There are very active faculty and there are others that are not. All things should balance out when looked at the College level.

The average workload in CSM is larger than any other college; this is mostly because of student supervision, which is hard to account for, and because faculty takes overloads to cover classes that need instructors.

A suggestions: add to the scholarly assigned time that faculty should involve students in their research. In this way we do not forget about our mission of forming students. This is an activity that UCs do not do, and that we could exploit for external funding, etc.

Regarding large classes. Most of the load has been taken by part-time instructors; it would be good to have full-time faculty taking care of lower division courses, so students have an early contact with faculty in their major. We should be careful when saying that every 120+ class should be taken the same way. For example, if the class requires heavy grading (writing classes) then it would be OK to give some help to the instructor. However, if the class is taught using clickers, with online homework, and multiple choice test, then the class does not need to have TAs or imply assigned time for the instructor. For example, if the class is large and it will get a TA or assigned time, we could require that exams are written and not multiple choice.

One more thought on this: student success is hard to achieve with 120+ students in a classroom.

The Dean asked when the tracks would kick in, he suggested that we could consider getting them started after tenure? after some discussion we thought maybe this would not be egalitarian. For sure, we should make sure that faculty teach at least one course per semester, mostly for those in the tenure track, as they need to prove that they are effective teachers before getting tenured.

One suggestion given for the TAs issue was to place grading in GE courses in labs? where TAs are easier to get?

### **Notes on the interview with Paul Beare (Dean), Kremen School of Education & Human Development.**

It seemed like a strong claim when Dean Blaire told me that people at Kremen do not like to take assigned time. It seems that faculty prefer to teach their classes above all things (there may be a slight shortage in instructors) and that the 'positions' available that grant assigned time are not so coveted because they carry a lot of work and stress (e.g. chair and program coordinators). Another fact that supports his claim is that they have not had any requests for sabbaticals in the last two years. Also, some time ago Kremen used to give assigned time for research and it did not work, so they started giving faculty a stipend and faculty like that system. Dean Blaire claims as well that if faculty could teach overloads and get paid for that then people would want to teach more than what they currently do? but that this is not possible by university regulations, although this would help solve their tenure density problem (worst College in Fresno State at this).

The work of chairs and supervisors is so complex because they have some external rules to follow (accreditations and state-given ways to carry credentialing that are evaluated every so often) and so these positions are 'worse' at Kremen than at other colleges. The credentialing has to be reported and supervised by these 'administrators' and this is for a ton of students.

Student supervision counts for 0.5 WTUs per students, but it is a lot of work, as faculty have to visit students eight times in a semester at schools that are a drive away (I think this sounds fair, as 0.5 unit of supervision is for 90 minutes a week of contact, for 15 weeks). In any case, people prefer to teach a class than supervising six students. Hence, most of the supervision is done by part-timers. Same thing with counseling of students.

Given the units for supervision and the myriad of program coordinators needed + chairs, the average teaching load for full-time faculty at Kremen is about 8.5 WTUs per semester.

Kremen had an endowment of one million dollars destined to support assigned time for research but they lacked accountability and so they had various cases of people being supported for 7-8 semesters with nothing to show at the end, and people not being supported being more productive (in the average) than those that were supported. Hence, they went on to this 'stipend for research' system that seemingly makes everybody happy. Also, it is very expensive to give assigned time because of benefits, so the 'stipend' system works better because of this as well (cheaper).

The doctoral programs Kremen has must have (WASC accreditation) some kind of doctoral culture associated to them, hence faculty teaching in these programs must publish (in serious journals) regularly. Also, 3-unit courses count for 4.5 WTUs for the instructor and also the programs provide money for faculty to use to hire RAs, or money to go to conferences, etc.

Dean Blaire was very clear that our salaries are pretty bad and that he would like to give people more chances to make money and that he feels this is the sentiment across his college. Time is definitely not something they would be willing to pursue.

### **Notes on the interview with Sheldon Axler, Chair of the Mathematics Department at San Francisco State University.**

We interviewed Sheldon Axler from SFSU to learn how his institution implemented support for research faculty. These are some excerpts of this conversation.

SFSU has a workload of 15 WTUs per semester; 9 WTUs teaching, 3 WTUs of research, and 3 WTUs service. San Diego State gives 6 WTU for research. His memory of the transition process was that they 'just did it' (he was chair of the Math Department at the time). They had an administration body that was supportive, though, and that was important.

When they hire new faculty, they are looking for people who are excellent at teaching and excellent at research. But, since to be a good teacher you need to be intellectually alive, active in research, there is a need and an expectation of having well-rounded faculty. Also, they do not want faculty to be teaching the stuff they learned 20 years ago, they want cutting edge, recent stuff, in the classroom; so only faculty who are active will know what is going on. Finally, they believe that students will learn by doing projects, the classroom is not enough; so if you do not do any research yourself then how are you going to get something for your students?

Reading RTP folders, he has seen, in the average, that the best teachers are also the best researchers. So, teaching and research go hand in hand. So when he started trying to increase the research profile of his department, he used Stanford, Berkeley, etc people who wanted to stay around, so they hired very good people. Use that people want to be in CA to hire very good people.

What they did was simple, with the support of his Dean, people active in research will have 9 WTUs of teaching. They gave the benefit of the doubt to borderline cases. In order to compensate for this they raised class sizes. He says that it would be easy to do in Math than in any others sciences, as startup funds are not an issue. He also said that Science was ahead of the rest of campus on this issue, but that then every college did the same. Now there is no turning back, there would be a revolt on campus if they went back to 12-12.

One has to sell this to the whole department, it is good for the department, good for students, etc.