

The page features a decorative graphic consisting of several overlapping circles in various shades of blue, arranged in a diagonal line from the top right towards the bottom right. Two thin, light blue lines intersect to form a large 'V' shape that frames the text on the left side of the page.

# **Connecticut State University System**

A Report on the Status of Academic Work Life

Study commissioned by the  
**CSU AAUP**

Study conducted by the  
**New England Resource Center for  
Higher Education (NERCHE), University  
of Massachusetts Boston**

Principal Investigator: Dr. Jay R. Dee

Fall 2010



## Introduction

### Purpose of the study

The New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) at the University of Massachusetts Boston conducted a comprehensive study of academic workload issues at the four institutions that comprise the Connecticut State University (CSU) system. The overarching goal of the study was to examine the effects of changing academic workloads on the ability of the CSU system to provide high quality education. To address this goal, the following research objectives were investigated:

- how the workloads of full-time and part-time faculty are changing in order to address: 1) the need to respond to students who have different levels of academic skill and preparation, 2) the need to incorporate innovative pedagogies to enhance student learning, 3) the need to address expectations for assessment of student learning outcomes, and 4) the need for faculty to remain current within dynamic, rapidly-changing academic fields and disciplines
- how the workloads of full-time, tenure-track faculty have been affected by: 1) an increasing emphasis on the importance of advising students, 2) changing expectations for research productivity, 3) an increasing need for faculty involvement in institutional service, and 4) the growing complexity of leading academic programs and chairing academic departments
- whether the faculty load credit (FLC) system appropriately accounts for the instructional and non-instructional activities of faculty members
- how the workloads of librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors are changing in their professional and pedagogical interactions with students and other university stakeholders
- how the 4-4 teaching load (12 credits per semester) affects faculty in their teaching, research, and service roles; and how the teaching load may impact faculty recruitment and retention
- how the work of full-time faculty may be affected by: 1) the increasing use of part-time faculty who are not paid for duties outside the classroom such as student advising and service on committees, and 2) increasing student enrollments at CSU institutions
- how administrators at CSU institutions perceive these academic workload issues

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected to characterize the workloads of full-time and part-time faculty, librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors.

Survey data were collected to characterize workloads and collect information regarding perceptions of the work environment. In faculty surveys, several items collected data that were compared to national averages for faculty at similar institutions. The surveys also collected information regarding the types of pedagogical practices used by CSU AAUP members in their efforts to foster student learning.

Interview data were used to examine how workloads are experienced by full-time and part-time CSU AAUP members. These data identified organizational structures, practices, and policies that shape and influence workloads. The interviews also provided data regarding how CSU AAUP members perceive and experience the work environment.

Faculty load credit data were used to examine how the full-time faculty workload is allocated to various instructional and non-instructional responsibilities. This study reports the total amount of load credits earned by faculty members, as well as how those load credits were distributed across different domains of activity. The study also examined the number of load credits earned by part-time faculty members, as well as the categories in which those credits were awarded.

This report offers an analysis of workload issues that were in common across all four CSU institutions. Furthermore, survey findings for librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors are also presented in this report.<sup>1</sup> Finally, the report provides recommendations that seek to enhance the capacity of the four CSU institutions to offer high quality education for all students.

### **Overview of data sources**

Data sources for this study included:

#### **Institutional Data**

- Faculty load credit data supplied by the CSU system for four academic years: 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009

#### **Survey Data**

- Two surveys of all full-time faculty members in the CSU system (spring 2009, fall 2009)
- Two surveys of all part-time faculty members in the CSU system (spring 2009, fall 2009)
- Surveys of all full-time and part-time librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors in the CSU system (spring 2010)

#### **Interview Data**

- 40 interviews with full-time faculty members
- 19 interviews with part-time faculty members
- 23 interviews with academic department chairs
- 11 interviews with faculty search committee chairs
- 17 interviews with administrators
- 8 interviews with librarians
- 8 interviews with coaches/trainers
- 7 interviews with a counselors
- 2 focus groups with librarians (total of 10 participants)
- 2 focus groups with coaches/trainers (total of 6 participants)

---

<sup>1</sup> For librarians, coaches, trainers, counselors, and part-time faculty, the total number of survey respondents was low for all four CSU institutions. Therefore, these survey data will be presented in the system-wide report, rather than in the separate reports for each institution.

<b>Total Interviews</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Western</b>
40 interviews with full-time faculty members	13	10	10	7
19 interviews with part-time faculty members	5	5	4	5
23 interviews with academic department chairs	7	5	6	5
11 interviews with faculty search committee chairs	3	3	2	3
17 interviews with administrators	5	4	4	4
8 interviews with librarians	1	2	2	3
8 interviews with coaches/trainers	2	2	1	3
7 interviews with counselors	2	2	2	1
2 focus groups with librarians (10 total participants)	1	1	0	0
2 focus groups with coaches/trainers (6 total participants)	1	0	1	0

### Survey data: National comparative analyses

Faculty survey findings were compared to data from the **National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty** (NSOPF). NSOPF data were collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (U.S. Department of Education) through a national faculty survey. The 2004 NSOPF included a sample of 1,080 public and private postsecondary institutions, and a sample of 35,000 faculty, with a response rate of 76%. NSOPF represents the most comprehensive national database on faculty workloads and faculty perceptions of academic work life.

NSOPF relies on the 2000 Carnegie Classification of Higher Education Institutions, in which all four CSU institutions were classified as **public master's I**. Therefore, comparisons in this study were made to faculty data from that institutional sector. For more information about NSOPF, go to:

<http://www.nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf/>

### Survey data: Response rates

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Western</b>
<b>Full-time faculty survey 1 (spring 2009)</b>	435 of 1174 (37.1%)	122 of 401 (30.4%)	76 of 178 (42.7%)	156 of 397 (39.3%)	81/198 (40.9%)
<b>Full-time faculty survey 2 (fall 2009)</b>	446 of 1273 (35.0%)	139 of 424 (32.8%)	86 of 187 (46.0%)	157 of 444 (35.4%)	64 of 218 (29.4%)
<b>Part-time faculty survey 1 (spring 2009)</b>	175 of 1090 (16.1%)	87 of 373 (23.3%)	16 of 145 (11.0%)	47 of 396 (11.9%)	25 of 176 (14.2%)
<b>Part-time faculty survey (fall 2009)</b>	190 of 1675 (11.3%)	50 of 517 (9.7%)	26 of 231 (11.3%)	75 of 626 (12.0%)	39 of 301 (13.0%)
<b>Librarians survey (spring 2010)</b>	35 of 80 (43.8%)	10	12	5	8
<b>Coaches/trainers survey (spring 2010)</b>	32 of 121 (26.4%)	11	10	8	3
<b>Counselors survey (spring 2010)</b>	7 of 14 (50.0%)	2	2	2	1

For the part-time faculty surveys, the response rates and the total number of respondents were low for all four CSU institutions. The reason for the low response rate may be related to the survey distribution method. For the most part, the email addresses provided by CSU AAUP were university email accounts, which part-time faculty may not check regularly.

### **Faculty load credit data**

Faculty load credit data were supplied by the CSU system, and were limited to four academic years. Data consistency and reliability concerns precluded the ability to examine data from earlier years. The CSU system does not maintain data regarding student credit hour production by academic department. Therefore, we could not examine average course enrollments across academic departments.

Note: Student credit hour production refers to the number of students enrolled in each course multiplied by the number of course credit hours.

For several analyses of faculty load credit data, we **controlled for sabbaticals and leaves** in order to report more accurately instructional and non-instructional load credit activities. To control for sabbaticals and leaves, we took the total number of load credits allocated for sabbaticals, medical leave, and unpaid leave in a given semester, and divided that number by 12. This number was viewed to be the most accurate computation of the number of faculty members on sabbatical or leave in a particular semester. We then reduced the full-time faculty headcount in that semester by the computed number of faculty on leave or sabbatical. Finally, load credits for sabbaticals, medical leave, and unpaid leave were subtracted from analyses that pertained to computing the proportion of load credits that were awarded for instructional and non-instructional activities.

### **Interview and focus group participants: Selection procedures**

The study utilized two sources to obtain recommendations for potential interview and focus group participants. Names of potential study participants were supplied by a faculty representative of CSU AAUP at each university, and by the academic deans and chief academic officer at each university. The principal investigator of the study then considered the two sets of recommendations in terms of the study's criteria for selecting study participants.

The criteria for selecting interview and focus group participants were: 1) served in their current role for more than one year, or chaired more than one search committee; 2) the department or unit in which the individual works has engaged in an extensive change initiative – for example, new assessment process, online program development – that is likely to have had significant implications for faculty workloads; and 3) appropriate representation of the disciplinary variation at each university, including undergraduate and graduate programs. The principal investigator selected approximately equal numbers of study participants from both the list supplied by CSU AAUP and the names recommended by the deans and chief academic officers (several names were recommended on both lists). The principal investigator contacted selected individuals via email, and inquired regarding their willingness to participate voluntarily in the study.

## Part One: Finding 1

### Average Faculty Work Weeks

In the spring 2009 survey, full-time faculty completed two items that collected information regarding hours worked per week. The first survey item asked faculty members to report the total number of hours that they worked for the institution (both paid and unpaid), as well as the total number of hours that they worked external to the institution (both paid consulting and unpaid public/professional service). The second survey item asked faculty to report the number of hours per week that they spend on a wide range of academic activities. When these items were totaled, the average number of hours per week for the second item was higher than the average number of hours per week for the first item.

The different results for these two survey items may be explained by the structure of the survey. When asked to report hours per week devoted to specific tasks (rather than to general categories), faculty might recall a more comprehensive set of professional activities, and therefore report a higher number of hours worked.

---

#### Average faculty work week

##### Survey item 1

Full-time faculty at all four CSU institutions worked more hours per week than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions.

	Paid work for institution	Unpaid work for institution	External work, paid	External work, unpaid	Total
Central	44.1	6.8	0.9	3.2	55.0
Eastern	44.5	8.1	1.4	3.2	57.2
Southern	43.6	7.8	1.8	2.6	55.8
Western	41.4	5.6	2.9	3.5	53.4
<b>National average</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>53.2</b>

**Average faculty work week**  
**Survey item 2**

As noted above, the second survey item collected more specific information regarding the activities in which faculty are engaged. Here, the total number of hours worked per week was higher than for the first survey item. The average faculty work week was 61.0 hours at Central, 59.9 hours at Eastern, 60.5 hours at Southern, and 58.2 hours at Western.

Full-time faculty at Central, Eastern, and Western allocated a larger percentage of their time to **undergraduate instruction** than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions.

Full-time faculty at Central and Southern allocated a larger percentage of their time to **graduate instruction** than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions.

Full-time faculty at Central and Eastern allocated a larger percentage of their time to **research, creative, and scholarly activity** than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions.

	<i>National average</i>	<i>Central</i>	<i>Eastern</i>	<i>Southern</i>	<i>Western</i>
Undergraduate instruction	28.30 hours (53.2%)	32.58 hours (53.4%)	35.12 hours (58.7%)	29.92 hours (49.5%)	35.47 hours (61.0%)
Graduate instruction	6.28 hours (11.8%)	8.92 hours (14.6%)	2.99 hours (5.0%)	10.46 hours (17.3%)	5.12 hours (8.8%)
Research	7.93 hours (14.9%)	10.29 hours (16.9%)	11.32 hours (18.9%)	8.75 hours (14.5%)	7.99 hours (13.7%)
Other (including service)	10.69 hours (20.1%)	9.22 hours (15.1%)	10.43 hours (17.4%)	11.35 hours (18.8%)	9.57 hours (16.5%)
Total	53.2 hours (100%)	61.01 hours (100%)	59.86 hours (100%)	60.48 hours (100%)	58.15 hours (100%)

Full-time faculty at the four CSU institutions allocated smaller percentages of their time to the **service and other activities** category than the national average. This finding, however, must be interpreted cautiously, since the “service/other” category combines a wide variety of activities, including institutional service, public service outreach, administrative responsibilities, and external consulting.

## Part One: Finding 2 Summer Workload

Full-time faculty members at the four CSU institutions are engaged during the summer months in a significant amount of work, which connects to their faculty roles at their respective institutions.

Excluding summer teaching:

- faculty at Central worked the equivalent of nearly six 40-hour work weeks, during the summer
- faculty at Eastern worked the equivalent of more than five 40-hour work weeks
- faculty at Southern worked the equivalent of more than five 40-hour work weeks
- faculty at Western worked the equivalent of more than four 40-hour work weeks

Summer Activity	Average number of hours spent on activity during summer 2009			
	Central	Eastern	Southern	Western
Preparing for classes for the next academic year	39.2	31.5	36.9	32.4
Research and other scholarly activity	140.7	123.8	105.7	100.2
Supervising students in internships or field placements	5.3	1.4	4.2	4.1
Administrative responsibilities (department chair, program coordinator)	31.2	32.8	32.6	9.9
Advising students within your department or program (include work with student clubs)	5.4	2.8	7.1	4.1
Thesis direction (includes master's and doctoral theses/dissertations)	3.2	0.8	6.7	2.0
Unpaid (pro bono) professional service and outreach activities to external organizations, such as K-12 schools, community organizations, and state agencies (do not include paid consulting work)	6.8	2.8	4.9	8.7
Unpaid (pro bono) service to academic professional associations and journals in my field or discipline	7.2	9.7	7.5	12.0
<b>Total hours of academic work during summer 2009 (average)</b>	<b>239.0</b>	<b>205.6</b>	<b>205.6</b>	<b>173.4</b>

## Part One: Finding 3 Faculty Load Credits

### Instructional and non-instructional load credits

Across the four years for which data were provided, full-time faculty at Eastern received the highest number of instructional load credits, while full-time faculty at Southern received the highest number of non-instructional load credits.

	Total FLCs	Instructional FLCs	% of total	Non-instructional FLCs	% of total
Central	11.94	9.84	82.4%	2.10	17.6%
Eastern	12.78	11.08	86.7%	1.70	13.3%
Southern	11.81	8.63	73.1%	3.18	26.9%
Western	12.16	9.89	81.3%	2.27	18.7%

### Faculty Load Credit (FLC) Categories in Data Provided by CSU System Office

Instructional load credit activities	Non-instructional load credit activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Courses</li> <li>• Labs</li> <li>• Supervision of student-teachers</li> <li>• Independent studies</li> <li>• Thesis supervision</li> <li>• Supplemental credits for labs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special assignments</li> <li>• Administrative duties</li> <li>• Reassigned time for curriculum development</li> <li>• Reassigned time for research</li> <li>• Online course development</li> <li>• Reassigned time for external grants</li> <li>• Other non-instructional assignments</li> </ul>

### Reassigned time for research

Reassigned time for research comprised 4.2% of the load credits awarded to faculty at Central, and the comparable percentages at the other CSU institutions were 3.3% at Southern, 2.2% at Western, and 1.4% at Eastern.

	Percentage of FLCs Awarded for Research
Central	4.2%
Eastern	1.4%
Southern	3.3%
Western	2.2%

According to the collective bargaining agreement (August 2007 – August 2011), **Central** is obligated to award 64.8 load credits per semester for reassigned time for research (article 10.6.4). Central has exceeded that minimum standard in all eight semesters, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 208.3.

					Current Collective Bargaining Agreement				
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	overall average
Reassigned time for research	195.0	162.8	192.3	209.2	190.1	214.5	252.3	250.3	208.3

**Eastern** is obligated to award 21.6 load credits per semester for reassigned time for research (article 10.6.4). Eastern has exceeded that minimum standard in all eight semesters, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 33.0.

					Current Collective Bargaining Agreement				
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	overall average
Reassigned time for research	27.0	39.0	39.0	24.0	36.0	33.0	30.0	36.0	33.0

**Southern** is obligated to award 64.8 load credits per semester for reassigned time for research (article 10.6.4). Southern has exceeded that minimum standard in all nine semesters, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 157.7.

					Current Collective Bargaining Agreement					
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	overall average
Reassigned time for research	153.0	155.0	154.5	156.0	148.0	148.0	165.0	170.5	169.5	157.7

**Western** is obligated to award 25.8 load credits per semester for reassigned time for research (article 10.6.4). Western has exceeded that minimum standard in all eight semesters for which data are available, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 53.4.

					Current Collective Bargaining Agreement				
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	overall average
Reassigned time for research	44.0	36.0	31.0	55.5	35.0	70.0	78.5	77.0	53.4

### Reassigned time for curriculum development

Reassigned time for curriculum development comprised 10.3% of the total load credits awarded to faculty at Southern. The comparable percentages at the other CSU institutions were 7.9% at Western, 4.5% at Eastern, and 4.4% at Central.

	Percentage of FLCs Awarded for Curriculum Development
Central	4.4%
Eastern	4.5%
Southern	10.3%
Western	7.9%

According to the collective bargaining agreement, **Central** is obligated to provide 132 load credits per semester for reassigned time for curriculum development, faculty development, and instructional enhancement. Central has exceeded that minimum standard in all eight semesters, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 215.7.

	Current Collective Bargaining Agreement								overall average
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	
Reassigned time for curriculum development	227.5	137.7	171.3	240.5	226.0	208.0	258.0	256.5	215.7

**Eastern** is obligated to provide 64 load credits per semester for reassigned time for curriculum development, faculty development, and instructional enhancement. Eastern has exceeded that minimum standard in all eight semesters, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 105.2.

	Current Collective Bargaining Agreement								overall average
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	
Reassigned time for curriculum development	104.1	104.1	98.7	103.4	107.0	88.4	123.1	112.4	105.2

**Southern** is obligated to provide 132 load credits per semester for reassigned time for curriculum development, faculty development, and instructional enhancement. Southern has exceeded that minimum standard in all nine semesters, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 488.8.

	Current Collective Bargaining Agreement									overall average
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	
Reassigned time for curriculum development	455.0	427.1	454.3	446.0	512.7	564.5	536.2	564.2	439.0	488.8

**Western** is obligated to provide 87 load credits per semester for reassigned time for curriculum development, faculty development, and instructional enhancement. Western has exceeded that minimum standard in all eight semesters for which data are available, including those prior to the current collective bargaining agreement. The average per semester was 193.2.

	Current Collective Bargaining Agreement								overall average
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	
Reassigned time for curriculum development	189.3	178.8	175.5	194.5	213.5	217.6	194.3	182.3	193.2

**Reassigned time for administrative duties and special assignments**

Among the CSU institutions, Western awarded the highest percentage of load credits for administrative duties, but Western did not allocate any load credits for special assignments.

	Percentage of FLCs Awarded for Administrative Duties	Percentage of FLCs Awarded for Special Assignments
Central	6.8%	0.9%
Eastern	5.7%	1.0%
Southern	7.3%	4.9%
Western	7.9%	0.0%

### Sabbatical load credits

Among the CSU institutions, Eastern awarded the largest amount of sabbatical load credits per full-time faculty member. Nevertheless, faculty at all four CSU institutions reported that the sabbatical application process was competitive, and that the universities did not provide a sufficient amount of load credits for sabbaticals.

	Average sabbatical load credits per year	Average full-time faculty headcount	Average sabbatical load credits, per full-time faculty member, per year
Central	207	422.25	0.490
Eastern	162	193.75	0.836
Southern	265.6	420.3	0.632
Western	115.5	207.5	0.557

### Part-time faculty and instructional load credits

The 2007-2011 collective bargaining agreement specifies that no more than 20% of instructional load credits should be attributable to part-time faculty. All four CSU institutions, however, surpassed this contractual limit. The discrepancy between the contractual standard and the percentage obtained in calculations for this study should be a subject for discussion between CSU AAUP and university administration.

	Percentage of instructional load credits attributable to part-time faculty
Central	32.5%
Eastern	32.3%
Southern	42.2%
Western	38.7%

### Lab-based courses and load credits

Based on calculations reported in the four institutional reports, the CSU institutions would be able to award one load credit for each laboratory/studio hour taught, if they were to allocate the following additional increments of load credit:

- Central would need to allocate 50.5 additional load credits per year (beyond those already designated as supplemental lab credits)
- Eastern would need to allocate 10 additional load credits per year
- Southern would need to allocate 180.5 additional load credits per year
- Western would need to allocate 20.4 additional load credits per year

The comparatively larger amounts of additional load credits needed at Central and Southern are attributable, in part, to the fact that neither institution fulfilled contractual requirements for providing supplemental lab credit (article 10.6.4).

**Central** is obligated to award 27.0 load credits per semester for supplemental lab credit, or 54 load credits per academic year. Central did not meet this minimum threshold in any of the semesters examined in this study.

					Current Collective Bargaining Agreement				
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	overall average per semester
Supplemental lab credit	10.8	8.6	11.2	18.0	19.3	15.1	15.5	13.7	14.0

**Eastern** is obligated to award 9.0 load credits per semester for supplemental lab credit, or 18 load credits per year. Eastern has met this minimum threshold each semester since the current collective bargaining agreement was ratified.

					Current Collective Bargaining Agreement				
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	overall average per semester
Supplemental lab credit	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.25

**Southern** is obligated to award 27.0 load credits per semester for supplemental lab credit, or 54 load credits per academic year. Southern did not meet this minimum threshold in any of the semesters examined in this study.

					Current Collective Bargaining Agreement					
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	overall average per semester
Supplemental lab credit	2.3	2.2	2.0	3.0	2.3	1.5	2.8	3.5	2.3	2.4

**Western** is obligated to award 10.75 load credits per semester for supplemental lab credit, or 21.5 load credits per academic year. Western met this minimum threshold in seven of the eight semesters for which data were supplied; the exception was Fall 2008.

					<b>Current Collective Bargaining Agreement</b>				
	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	overall average per semester
Supplemental lab credit	14.0	22.6	16.0	13.1	14.1	17.1	9.8	14.8	15.2

## Part One: Finding 4 Pedagogy and Teaching Practices

### Pedagogical practices in undergraduate courses

Full-time faculty members at the four CSU institutions were more likely than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions to use a range of pedagogical practices, which research has shown to be effective in terms of promoting student learning.

While the overall profile of teaching practices across the CSU institutions strongly reflects the use of effective pedagogy, the findings also point toward some areas for concern. Effective pedagogical practices often take additional time to develop and implement. Heavy teaching loads may dissuade some faculty members from adopting innovative pedagogies. Potential areas for concern are highlighted in the tables below.

Teaching practice	Institutions where faculty used the practice at rates <u>higher than</u> the national average			
Assess multiple drafts of students’ written work	Central	Eastern	Southern	
Students deliver oral presentations in class	Central	Eastern	Southern	Western
Group/team projects	Central	Eastern	Southern	
Peer feedback on students’ written work	Central	Eastern	Southern	Western
Research and writing assignments	Central	Eastern	Southern	
Lab, shop, and studio assignments	Central			
Essay exams	Central			
Short-answer exams	Central		Southern	Western
Multiple-choice exams				Western

Teaching practice	Institutions where faculty used the practice at rates <u>less than</u> the national average			
Service-learning and co-op experiences	Central			
Essay exams				Western
Multiple-choice exams		Eastern	Southern	
Short-answer exams		Eastern		
Lab, shop, and studio assignments			Southern	
Research and writing assignments				Western

## Innovation in teaching

In addition to examining teaching practices in undergraduate courses, this study explored the types of changes that faculty were making to their courses, both undergraduate and graduate. The spring 2009 faculty survey identified full-time faculty who had taught at their respective CSU institution for at least two years, and asked those faculty to describe recent changes that they had made to their courses within the previous two academic years.

The findings indicated that faculty in the CSU system are engaged extensively in innovative practices to improve teaching and learning. The most common innovative practices are displayed in the table below.

Innovative practice	Percentage of full-time faculty who have engaged in the practice within the previous two years			
	Central	Eastern	Southern	Western
Revised syllabus to devote more attention to building students' academic skills in reading, writing, or math	78.7%	86.7%	74.3%	58.7%
Changed teaching practices to get students more involved in their own learning (e.g., through hands-on projects, group work, student-led presentations)	90.4%	96.7%	92.2%	77.8%
Changed class readings and discussion topics to include more perspectives from different cultural or ethnic backgrounds and traditions	60.8%	80.0%	72.8%	54.8%
Experimented with new teaching approaches	91.4%	95.1%	91.5%	84.1%
Incorporated new technologies into my teaching practices (e.g., web sites, blogs)	78.5%	80.4%	68.8%	74.6%

## Part One: Finding 5

### Faculty Job Satisfaction and the Academic Work Environment

#### Job satisfaction

NSOPF contains national data on faculty job satisfaction. In spring 2009, we collected comparative data from full-time faculty at the four CSU institutions. Some of the findings suggest the potential for concern regarding faculty morale.

The table below notes the dimensions of the work environment for which faculty reported a **higher level of dissatisfaction or disagreement** than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions. Thus, the table below identifies areas of concern.

Dimension of the academic work environment	Institutions where faculty reported a higher level of dissatisfaction or disagreement than the national average			
Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities (teaching with technology)	Central	Eastern	Southern	Western
Your workload	Central	Eastern	Southern	Western
Faculty at this institution are rewarded for good teaching	Central	Eastern	Southern	Western
Women faculty members are treated fairly at this institution	Central	Eastern		Western
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups are treated fairly at this institution	Central	Eastern		
Part-time faculty are treated fairly at this institution	Central	Eastern		
Institutional support for teaching improvement (including grants, release time, and professional development funds)		Eastern		Western
Your salary		Eastern		
Your job at this institution, overall		Eastern		
The quality of equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction			Southern	

## The academic work environment

The spring 2009 full-time faculty survey included several items that examined the academic work environment. The table below indicates the items for which the majority of faculty reported dissatisfaction or disagreement. Thus, the table below notes areas of concern.

Dimension of the academic work environment	Institutions where the majority of faculty reported dissatisfaction or disagreement			
Institutional support for research, creative, and other scholarly activities (including grants, release time, and research administration)	Central	Eastern	Southern	
Availability of child care at this institution	Central	Eastern	Southern	
Institutional support for faculty to engage in public/community outreach			Southern	
Support services (secretarial and/or professional staff support)				Western
Administrators at this institution consider faculty concerns when making policy.	Central			
Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making.	Central			
This institution's faculty evaluation and reward system is a good fit with my scholarly research and teaching interests.	Central	Eastern	Southern	
The criteria for tenure and promotion at this institution are clear.	Central	Eastern		
The work environment at this institution fosters a balance between work and personal life.	Central	Eastern	Southern	
This institution provides sufficient support for faculty development.	Central	Eastern		
Faculty at this institution are rewarded for serving the public/community.		Eastern	Southern	Western

## Part One: Finding 6

### Teaching Loads and Teaching Effectiveness

The primary concerns expressed by study participants regarding the CSU teaching load were:

1. Current teaching loads limit pedagogical innovation and interfere with faculty efforts to promote student learning.
2. Current teaching loads may not allow faculty to remain current within their respective disciplines, and therefore, they may not be able to deliver a state-of-the-art, university-level curriculum to students.
3. The faculty load credit system does not appropriately account for faculty workloads associated with teaching lab or studio courses.

#### Pedagogical innovation

While survey findings suggest that CSU faculty use effective pedagogical practices at rates higher than national averages for faculty in “public master’s I” institutions, the interview data indicate that some faculty are beginning to scale back their pedagogical ambitions due to heavy teaching loads. Faculty members espoused a high level of commitment to teaching, and they displayed an awareness of the pedagogical practices that are most likely to promote student learning. Yet, they also noted that their workloads often prevent them from putting these pedagogies into practice. As a faculty member in the humanities at Eastern explained, “I am committed to undergraduate teaching. The thing that is compromising my undergraduate teaching the most is how much undergraduate teaching I have to do.”

Effective pedagogical practices are often labor-intensive for the faculty who implement them. CSU faculty members indicated that the 4-4 teaching load, coupled with rising research and service expectations, does not provide them with sufficient time to incorporate these pedagogies into their courses. They also reported a high level of frustration with not being able to use their preferred teaching approaches due to the number of courses and students that they were teaching. An assistant professor in the humanities at Eastern, for example, explained how she felt compelled to scale back the writing assignments that she gives to her students.

The biggest workload issue for me is the sheer number of students. In my first semester, I taught 140 students and I gave a lot of writing assignments. But now, I don’t give anywhere near as many writing assignments. That was hard for me, because I want to teach students how to write, but there are survival issues for me, as well.

The teaching workload is further amplified, according to faculty members, by the need to work with students in developing their academic skills, particularly in writing, math, and critical thinking. A faculty member in a professional field at Southern, for example, noted that “we are teaching students who are very bright, but come without a lot of basic skills, and that adds time to our teaching load.” Similarly, a department chair at Western noted that “even the best students nowadays do not have the greatest skills with regard to writing and communication.”

For the most part, CSU faculty did not blame students for lack of effort, nor did they employ a “sink or swim” approach that sought to “weed out” the less prepared students. Instead, many faculty members described how they reached out individually to students who were struggling, but they also explained the workload implications of such efforts. A faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern, for example, described the pedagogical practices that are associated with improving student writing: “The teaching of writing is not just looking at the writing. The faculty member has to also work with the thinking patterns and reading levels of the students to make them good writers.”

Faculty explained that they did not want to work less, but instead they wanted to reallocate their current workloads in different ways. As a faculty member in arts and sciences at Western argued:

Workload is not the issue. Teaching load is the issue. Faculty need to be working differently, not less. And [faculty] don’t want to be working less. What they want to be doing is working in ways that encompass a range of professional activities, but they are prevented from doing so because of the high teaching load.

Some academic department chairs indicated that they encourage faculty to teach two sections of the same course each semester, to minimize preparation time; however, not all faculty have that opportunity, especially those who teach in specialized fields or graduate programs.

Faculty who teach in graduate programs, moreover, argued that preparing to teach a graduate course requires much more time than preparing an undergraduate course, yet graduate and undergraduate teaching loads are calculated in the same way. A faculty member in arts and sciences at Central, for example, explained that “graduate courses require a lot of faculty preparation time, more than the undergraduate courses. You are really dealing with much more advanced texts [in graduate courses], and it takes more time to develop lessons and assignments from them.”

In contrast to concerns about the teaching load, many faculty expressed strong support for the class size caps in the CSU system, which in their view, help maintain high-quality instruction. The strategic plan at Western, in fact, links class sizes to levels recommended by the professional societies of the various academic disciplines. Nevertheless, several study participants expressed apprehension that their class sizes would soon be raised.

### **Remaining current within the discipline**

Full-time faculty also indicated that the CSU teaching load does not allow them to remain current within their academic fields and disciplines; therefore, they expressed concerns regarding whether they can deliver a state-of-the-art, university-level curriculum to students. Study participants acknowledged that their respective institutions are teaching universities, but they also argued that they need to remain active as scholars, so that their teaching is informed by the latest research in their respective fields and disciplines. A faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern, for example, stated that:

Not being able to pursue meaningful scholarship is at odds with one’s identity. And that’s coming from someone who is thrilled to be at a school like this. I didn’t have any desire to be at a Research I (university). I am committed to the work of teaching, but I need to do that as a scholar.

Study participants also noted that accreditation associations have voiced similar concerns regarding whether the 4-4 teaching load is compatible with providing high-quality, university-level education. A faculty member at Western, for example, described efforts by the School of Business to obtain AACSB accreditation: “The business school is under virtual orders from the accrediting agency to reduce the teaching load to 9 credits a semester.”

Full-time faculty, moreover, argued that the 4-4 teaching load does not allow them to devote concentrated periods of time to their research agendas. As a faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern explained,

There is no work-life balance. With this teaching load, you just have to forget about your research. You do research over the summer, and then once the semester starts, all the threads that you came up with during your research get cut, and often you do not have time to look at it for a month at a time.

Junior faculty, in particular, reported high levels of stress associated with their efforts to teach a 4-4 load and simultaneously establish their research agendas. A recently-tenured faculty member in arts and sciences at Central, for example, recalled her first few years on the job:

I almost left the job. It was too much. I was physically spent. Having a family at the same time is very challenging... I also feel that our efforts are underappreciated, and that people don't realize how much work goes on behind the scenes to be a good teacher. The biggest need right now is to do something about the credit load.

### **Lab and studio courses**

Lab-based courses are critical educational experiences in the preparation of future scientists. Teaching practices for lab-based courses, moreover, require extensive interactions between faculty and students, yet the CSU system provides only partial load credit for teaching such courses. Faculty receive 0.75 load credits for each hour of lab-based instruction, in contrast to the 1.0 load credit per instructional hour in other courses.

A faculty member in the sciences at Southern described how teaching practices in lab-based courses have changed in recent years, and now require much greater involvement from the faculty teaching those courses.

The old model was to give students the equivalent of a recipe, where if they followed procedures correctly, they should achieve a known result. That model didn't require a lot from the instructor. But the current practice is to set up realistic experiments where the results are not known in advance. This model requires the instructor to observe, assist, and trouble shoot during the lab.

Contemporary pedagogy in lab-based courses demands greater faculty involvement in the learning process. Furthermore, faculty at the CSU institutions are also responsible for setting up and taking down lab equipment. As a faculty member in the sciences at Western explained, “Since we don't have a graduate program with full-time students, we don't have graduate assistants, which means that it is up to faculty to set up and take down labs.”

A faculty member in the sciences at Central explained that teaching lab-based courses entails not only preparation of the lab space and equipment, but also extensive grading of student work. “A lot of heavy duty writing goes on in the labs; students are writing many lab reports, so there is a lot of grading. The work is at least equal to, or more than, a lecture. We could do away with the writing for students in the labs, but that would compromise the quality of the course.”

The CSU system should adjust the load credit amounts that faculty receive for teaching lab-based courses, so that the load credits reflect the current pedagogy employed in such courses. Given the central role that laboratory study plays in the development of the future scientists, the CSU system should take steps to remove any disincentives that may dissuade faculty in the sciences from using effective pedagogical practices. This issue is especially timely, given that national associations in the sciences are calling on colleges and universities to produce more, well-trained graduates in scientific, technological, engineering, and mathematical (STEM) fields.

## **Part One: Finding 7**

### **Research Expectations and Promotion and Tenure**

Study participants at all four CSU institutions indicated that expectations for faculty research were increasing. According to faculty members, these rising expectations can be traced to two factors: administrators who are engaged in a “chase for prestige” in which excellence is equated with the research university model, and a faculty hiring wave in the late 1990s that brought to CSU campuses many research-oriented scholars who now occupy positions of leadership in promotion and tenure committees. The accomplishments of the research-oriented faculty have been reinforced by administrators who appreciate the increased prestige and visibility that come with published research, as well as the potential contributions that faculty research can make to improving teaching and learning in the classroom.

These rising research expectations, however, have:

1. Resulted in some degree of confusion and uncertainty regarding how promotion and tenure criteria will be interpreted by review committees
2. Generated some concern among faculty regarding which forms and types of research will be considered valid by review committees
3. Created workload challenges, which have not been offset by sufficient amounts of reassigned time for research

#### **Promotion and tenure**

While the collective bargaining agreement assigns the most importance to teaching in the evaluation of faculty performance, study participants noted that research productivity was often the deciding factor in promotion and tenure decisions. A faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern, for example, argued that “the contract says that teaching has the most weight for P&T, but that is not being followed.” Likewise, a department chair at Western indicated that “in P&T, there have been changes. Within the last 5 or 6 years, more publications are needed.”

These rising research expectations, however, conflict with CSU’s maintenance of a 4-4 teaching load. A department chair in arts and sciences at Western, for example, explained that “in the past, there were no research expectations and people had a 4-4 load. Now the research expectations have increased, but there is still a 4-4 teaching load.”

Junior faculty, who are on the tenure track, reported confusion regarding whether they should prioritize teaching or research. As a junior faculty member in arts and sciences at Western explained:

I thought I was a very good fit with the department, since it is very teaching focused. But I am not sure if I am a good fit with the university, especially if the university is going to require more research. It is not that I don’t like doing research. It is just that I have no time to do it.

Faculty seeking promotion to full professor also described uncertainty regarding the level of research performance expected by review committees. Study participants described an increasing number of rejected applications for promotion to full professor.

### **Forms of scholarship**

Study participants noted that not only is the expected amount of research productivity increasing, but also, the expected forms of scholarship are shifting toward a research university model. Several faculty indicated that their institutions are caught up in a “chase for prestige,” which creates an emphasis on the types of scholarship that are typically produced at prestigious research universities. This emphasis, some study participants argued, serves as a disincentive for faculty to engage in other forms of scholarship, such as community engagement, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or research with undergraduate students. These other forms of scholarship, however, are often espoused as important priorities by university leaders. Thus, some faculty indicated that they are receiving mixed signals regarding the forms of scholarship that the university will view as valid and legitimate.

In order to mitigate confusion regarding promotion and tenure expectations, each CSU institution encouraged academic departments to develop discipline-specific guidelines for faculty performance. One function of these guidelines is to spell out the forms of scholarship that are valued within each academic department. Faculty, however, expressed different levels of confidence in the guidelines created by their respective departments. Some study participants were confident that university P&T committees would endorse and validate the forms of scholarship that were specified in their departmental guidelines. Other faculty were uncertain whether various forms of scholarship would be considered valid by administration and by P&T committees, even if those forms of scholarship were included in departmental guidelines. A faculty member in a professional field at Central, for example, explained how her department “is trying to articulate how we value community engagement as valid for P&T, but I am not sure if it will be accepted at the Provost level or the campus-wide P&T committee.” Likewise, a faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern argued that:

Previously, the research that I did on pedagogy would have been regarded as creative activity, but now it is not regarded as such anymore. It seems like the university wants to become a research institution in the traditional sense, and we just aren’t that. We are a teaching institution.

### **Reassigned time for research**

While the CSU institutions provide reassigned time for faculty to engage in research, many faculty argued that their respective universities were not supplying enough reassigned time. A faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern, for example, indicated that “we are worried that the requirements [for research] have kept increasing, while there is no extra reassigned time or institutional support to allow faculty to do the research, and the teaching load has remained the same.” Similarly, a faculty member in the sciences at Eastern noted that “there is a feeling that the administration wants faculty to do quality research, but they are not willing to provide a workload that is appropriate to achieve that.”

Furthermore, the CSU institutions tend to award reassigned time for research in small increments. These brief periods may not be sufficient for faculty to engage in scholarly projects that are larger in scope. A

junior faculty member in the sciences at Western, for example, explained that “even if you get reassigned time, you could just start a project, but still not be able to finish it before the reassigned time is up.”

Study participants also noted that sabbaticals were increasingly competitive, even though sabbaticals advance the research goals of the university. As a faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern explained, “It used to be that everyone used to get sabbaticals, but now, it has become very competitive.”

## **Part One: Finding 8**

### **Administrative Initiatives**

The CSU institutions have embarked on a number of new initiatives, which seek to strengthen student learning and enhance academic program quality. Similar initiatives have emerged across the four CSU institutions in the areas of student advising, first-year experience, internationalization, community engagement, and assessment. While faculty acknowledged the importance of such initiatives, they also expressed concerns regarding the workload implications of related projects, as well as the level of faculty involvement in making decisions about these endeavors.

#### **Strategic initiatives and workload**

Study participants noted that new initiatives were often established by university administration without identifying sufficient resources to carry out related projects. Faculty members were concerned that these new initiatives might not be implemented effectively due to resource limitations. For example, at Eastern, faculty indicated that the new liberal arts core curriculum was implemented without sufficient resources. Similarly, a department chair in a professional field at Central indicated that “there are several trends for administration, like internationalization or the first-year program, but there is never any funding to go with it.” Likewise, at Southern, administrators described an earlier attempt to hire more full-time faculty, in part, so that first-year seminars could be taught by full-time faculty, while also ensuring that necessary courses within the majors were covered. Resource limitations, however, have now sidelined that effort.

Department chairs expressed the strongest concerns regarding the workload implications of strategic initiatives. As a department chair in arts and sciences at Western noted, “All these initiatives from administration, like internationalization, advising, assessment, and accreditation, are all good, but we need more time to do them.” Another chair in arts and sciences at Western put the workload expectations of strategic initiatives into the broader context of faculty work roles: “So first, the research expectations have increased, and we still have a 4-4 teaching load. And now the same thing is happening with assessment. We have a new expectation, but without any change in the teaching load.”

Assessment emerged as a prominent point of contention between faculty and administration. While administrators described assessment as an extension of good teaching practices, faculty and chairs frequently characterized assessment as an administrative mandate that had significant implications for their workloads. A department chair in a professional field at Southern, for example, argued that “the administration sends down edicts [regarding assessment], but they haven’t been helpful in thinking through the systems and processes.”

Study participants acknowledged that assessment can be linked to regular teaching practices, but the management and organization of the assessment process for an academic department requires an extensive amount of time. Thus, chairs and some faculty indicated that assessment represents an expansion of their work roles. A department chair in arts and sciences at Western, for instance, explained that “no load credits are given for assessment and I think that’s a discrepancy. In arts and sciences, it is often the untenured faculty who are responsible for assessment, because the tenured faculty don’t want to do it, or the chairs do it themselves.”

## Faculty involvement in decision making

Faculty indicated that administrators tend to issue new policies and develop new structures without involving faculty, in a meaningful way, in the decision-making process. Study participants described a “we decide, you implement” perspective, where the decision-makers are administrators and the implementers are faculty. The implementers, however, reported that they have limited input toward the decisions that they are expected to carry out.

A department chair in arts and sciences at Central stated that “the administration’s biggest problem is that it tends to announce a new policy or plan without including faculty in the decision-making process.” Faculty offered several examples of administrative decisions that were made, in their view, without appropriate consultation with the faculty.

A faculty member in a professional field at Central offered two contrasting examples: a program that was developed with extensive faculty involvement and support, and an unpopular initiative that moved forward without sufficient consultation.

Institutional initiatives are not effective without the support of the faculty. The first-year experience is an example of a faculty-supported initiative that has worked well. But the advising center is an initiative that is not popular among the faculty.

A department chair in arts and sciences at Central also identified the decision to create a university-wide advising center as “an example of administration’s unilateral decision making.”

Similarly, an administrator at Southern contrasted the current level of faculty support for the first-year experience (FYE) program with a previous effort to establish first-year seminars.

A previous attempt to implement a first-year seminar in 2000-2001 generated some faculty resistance to what they perceived as non-academic content [e.g., adjusting to college life]... Now the seminar is very academic. A faculty committee designed it. The theme is the value of liberal education and it can be taught through the lens of any discipline. The FYE has helped to build a community of colleagues who are committed to our first-year students.

The long-term success of any strategic initiative in higher education is tied to the level and extent of collaboration between faculty and administration. Yet the implementation of new initiatives can expose significant gaps between the views and priorities of faculty and those of administration. On the CSU campuses, existing governance bodies, including the faculty senates, can serve as venues for greater communication and information sharing between faculty and administration. New venues, however, may also need to be created so that faculty and administrators can interact earlier in the decision-making process.

## **Part One: Finding 9**

### **Faculty Professional Development**

Each CSU institution has a center or office that is designated to provide in-house professional development opportunities for faculty. Study participants noted that these workshops and training sessions were not always well attended or relevant to the pedagogical interests of faculty. Furthermore, junior faculty reported minimal levels of engagement in professional development workshops, largely due to competing pressures and priorities for their time.

#### **Relevance of faculty development offerings**

Some study participants argued that faculty development activities are designed to advance the interests of administration, rather than the needs of faculty members. A department chair in a professional field, for example, described the history of faculty development programs at Central.

The Center for Teaching Excellence started as a faculty-driven forum in the early 1990s. Eventually, it became a center with funding from the trustees to support faculty professional development activities. The center offers seminars and workshops. The workshops used to be driven by faculty, but the provost has taken over planning for these workshops.

In contrast, an administrator at Southern noted that “the offerings [from the Office of Faculty Development] are faculty driven, although administrators sometimes make suggestions [for workshop topics].” Study participants indicated that the more effective faculty development workshops were organized and designed by faculty members themselves. Workshops that were not initiated by faculty, on the other hand, were not well attended. An assistant professor in the humanities at Eastern, for example, noted that “the university offers a lot of workshops, but none are of interest to me.”

Several pedagogically innovative faculty members in the CSU system indicated that they were not interested in the faculty development workshops provided by their respective institutions. Thus, some of the faculty members who could be providing significant leadership for faculty development are disengaged from the process.

In response to these concerns, the CSU institutions could explore ways to establish faculty-led, grassroots approaches to faculty development. In this model, the CSU institutions would continue to provide financial and administrative support for faculty development, but a team of faculty members would establish priorities for faculty development on campus. A faculty development team could be established at each CSU institution, and the knowledge and expertise of this group could serve as an important decision-making resource in each university’s ongoing efforts to improve teaching and learning.

In order to identify a relevant agenda for future faculty development offerings, faculty teams at each university could conduct campus-wide needs assessments. As a faculty member in a professional field at Southern suggested, “The university should conduct a needs assessment with special attention paid to what junior faculty need, and what the individual schools need in order to provide targeted professional

development.” The needs assessment results could guide decisions regarding which types of workshops and seminars to offer.

### **Professional development for junior faculty**

Junior faculty members frequently reported that it is difficult to find time to engage in professional development activities. They suggested that their workloads preclude them from full participation in professional development activities, and several professed that they cannot maintain an awareness of workshops offered on campus due to extensive competing workload demands. Such conditions may limit pedagogical innovation and experimentation among junior faculty.

Other universities have responded to this challenge by offering a **voluntary seminar for faculty on college teaching** (sometimes these are referred to as “faculty learning groups”). Faculty could receive a course load reduction (reassigned time) to participate in a year-long or semester-long seminar on college teaching and learning. The seminar could be led by a senior faculty member at each CSU institution, who has been recognized for teaching excellence and whose practice represents significant pedagogical innovation. Faculty seminar members could explore the research literature on college teaching, experiment with new teaching approaches in their classes, and seek feedback from the group on the results of their practice.

Study participants also spoke of efforts to provide new faculty with a course load reduction during their first year at the university. An administrator at Central, for example, noted that “schools try to give the new faculty research reassigned time so that they can organize both their teaching and their research better. Also at the dean’s discretion, new faculty have been given three credits release time either in their first or second semester to help them settle in.”

Course load reductions, however, may not be available for all new faculty. A department chair in a professional field at Central, for instance, noted that “the policy that granted new faculty [a course release in] one semester to begin their research will be suspended due to budgetary issues.” A faculty member in arts and sciences at Central also explained that “there is no provision for officially reducing the workload for new faculty in the first year.” The CSU institutions, therefore, should establish a standard policy for providing a course load reduction to all new junior faculty members. This practice could alleviate anxiety among new faculty members, as they develop their courses and establish their research agendas.

## **Part One: Finding 10**

### **Faculty Hiring Practices**

Faculty hiring practices can have a significant long-term impact on the teaching and learning environment of a higher education institution. These practices shape, to a large extent, who applies and who is selected to serve on the faculty at a particular institution. If hiring practices are inefficient and ineffective, then the institution may struggle to recruit and retain high quality faculty.

Study participants identified several obstacles and impediments in the faculty hiring process, including the lack of timely search procedures, and the lack of competitive salaries in some fields. Furthermore, faculty in some departments noted that the recent hiring freeze has created a faculty shortage, which constrains their ability to meet the needs of students and accommodate plans for enrollment growth.

#### **Timeliness of the search process**

Search committee chairs across the four CSU institutions were critical of the amount of time consumed to authorize searches and approve candidates for positions. They described administrative processes that were not timed to coincide with important calendar benchmarks in the academic job market. As a result, search committee chairs indicated that some of their top candidates accepted positions at other universities, before their administration could offer them a contract. As a search chair at Central explained, “The process of approvals for every stage takes a long time, and for our most recent search, out of the 28 viable candidates, only 12 were still available by the time we got approvals to contact them.” Similarly, an administrator at Eastern acknowledged that “the hiring process has traditionally been slow.”

The increasingly competitive academic job market requires the CSU institutions to take more aggressive actions in order to attract high quality faculty to the institution. In order to foster greater coordination and efficiency in the search process, a committee of administrators, faculty, and affirmative action staff at each university can develop a procedures manual to guide faculty searches and specify the steps necessary at each stage of the search process. Moreover, search procedures will need to be calibrated with key timelines in the national academic labor market.

In order to advertise positions earlier in the fall semester, CSU institutions would need to achieve two key tasks over the summer: decisions regarding the allocation of faculty lines to various departments for searches, and decisions regarding the approval of position descriptions to have the job posted. Thus, administrators and search committee chairs would need to work together over the summer in order to achieve these tasks.

To accelerate the process for approving and initiating searches, search committee chairs may need to acknowledge that their responsibilities will begin in the summer (likely throughout August). In this scenario, the total workload for chairing a search would not necessarily increase; the work would simply begin earlier. Additional compensation for such work in August may not be available, and search committee chairs may need to accept an earlier starting point for their responsibilities in order to be more competitive in the faculty job market.

## Competitive faculty salaries

Study participants in business, scientific, and technical fields argued that the CSU institutions do not provide competitive salaries, and therefore, they have experienced failed searches in their departments. A faculty member in the business school at Central, for example, argued that “CSU salary limitations make faculty recruitment difficult in the School of Business. Salary limitations accounted for two recent failed searches.” A faculty member in the sciences at Central also referred to a faculty search in a technical subfield where more lucrative jobs are available in industry: “The applicant pool was poor due in large part to our inability to compete with salary offered by industry.”

A faculty member in the School of Business at Western also noted how salaries often become a stumbling block in the hiring process: “We have conducted at least six consecutive searches without a hire. We send names to the dean and nothing happens. I think the university is low-balling people on money. We’re a collective bargaining school, so there is not much room to negotiate to begin with. It is frustrating.”

All four CSU institutions offer academic programs in areas where faculty labor markets intersect with those in business and industry. Careful benchmarking with peer institutions at the level of the academic department may be necessary in order to maintain faculty salaries at competitive levels.

## Faculty hiring plans

Study participants remarked on the impact of a recent hiring freeze and an early retirement incentive program. Some department chairs reported that their programs were scrambling to find emergency hires to offer necessary courses. “The hiring freeze hit my department hard,” explained a chair in a professional field at Central. “We have four tenure-track positions that need to be filled.” A faculty member in a professional field at Central noted that “we are dealing with the effects of the early retirement plan implemented by the university. Now, everyone has to do more with less.”

Department chairs explained that the hiring freeze and early retirement program have created faculty shortages that limit their ability to meet the needs of students and accommodate plans for enrollment growth. A department chair in a professional field at Southern explained how one program was compelled to limit enrollments due to the lack of a sufficient number of faculty.

The hiring freeze has had a big impact on our department. We had three searches at the beginning of the year [2009], and we were asked to give one up. Then, we were told to only hire people on a temporary, one-year basis. So nobody wanted to come in for an interview... We had to cut back on the number of students that we took in this year. It’s difficult, because we are a growing program. We could easily expand enrollments, but the big negative now is that we can’t fill faculty positions.

Similarly at Western, a department chair in arts and sciences noted that “we have been asked to increase the number of courses offered to accommodate the rising number of students in majors that need courses in our field. But we haven’t been able to do that because of a lack of faculty.” Another arts and sciences department chair at Western explained that the hiring freeze has created a faculty shortage in her department, and the full-time faculty have felt compelled to teach overloads in order to serve their students: “We need more faculty. We are being asked to carry overloads, and frequently.

Even though we are only supposed to carry 12 credits, I average more than 15, and I've got 26 credits built up."

Early retirement programs, coupled with hiring freezes, do not allow universities to make strategic decisions regarding the allocation of faculty lines. Therefore, programs that are experiencing or planning for growth may not have the necessary faculty resources to address student enrollments. As CSU emerges from current financial constraints and is able to hire new full-time faculty, each university will need to consider decisions regarding the allocation of faculty lines in relation to the institution's long term priorities. Each CSU institution should develop a faculty hiring plan, which would link future position allocations to specific strategic initiatives. Faculty leaders should be involved in the process of determining faculty hiring priorities, as each institution begins to add new full-time faculty positions.

## **Part One: Finding 11**

### **Part-Time Faculty: Evaluation, Communication, and Professional Development**

#### **Evaluation of part-time faculty**

At the four CSU institutions, the evaluation of part-time faculty was limited mainly to student course evaluations. Part-time faculty argued that the lack of evaluation hinders their professional growth and development, because they do not receive regular feedback from other faculty members about their teaching practices. Moreover, the lack of consistent evaluation shuts off another potential mechanism for more meaningful communication between full-time and part-time faculty, regarding the goals and priorities of the academic programs in which they teach.

Despite the need to engage part-time faculty more fully in departmental discussions of curriculum and learning outcomes, part-time faculty reported that they are largely disconnected from matters within their departments. A part-time faculty member in a professional field at Southern explained that “there is a lack of connection [to the full-time faculty]. There is no real opportunity to network, no organized program to network among the faculty, part-time and full-time.”

The need to provide additional evaluation procedures for part-time faculty does not stem from any specific teaching deficiencies among these instructors. Instead, this recommendation is based on the need to strengthen academic programs. Part-time faculty were concerned that limited evaluation practices would compromise academic program quality. As a part-time faculty member in arts and sciences at Western noted, “From an overall improvement aspect, there should be some [classroom] observation [of part-time faculty].” A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern also noted that there is “a complete lack of oversight, as a part-time faculty member. There is no establishment of standards or assessment of quality for the teaching of the course beyond the course evaluations.”

#### **Professional development for part-time faculty**

Furthermore, university-sponsored faculty development activities were not offered at times and in formats that were conducive to part-time faculty participation. A part-time faculty member in a professional field at Central stated that “most of the professional development opportunities are offered in the semester, during the day, when it’s not a good time for me. It doesn’t do me a lot of good. And there is nothing offered in the summer when I could be there more often.”

Likewise, a part-time faculty member in the social sciences at Eastern argued that “none of these workshops are designed for adjuncts. There has been no effort to tailor professional development workshops to the needs of part-time faculty or to find a way to include adjuncts in these programs.” A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences at Western also noted that:

I honestly can’t recall any professional development activities that I felt I was specifically invited to participate in. There may have been some activities that I thought were interesting, but I didn’t particularly feel that they were for me... I didn’t feel I was invited to participate.

Part-time faculty teach important introductory and lower-division courses in nearly every academic department in the CSU system. In these courses, part-time faculty interact extensively with first-year students, who are frequently the most susceptible to dropping out of college. In order to strengthen student learning and improve student retention, the CSU institutions need to devote additional attention and resources to supporting the growth and development of part-time faculty.

Furthermore, institutions should not assume that experienced professionals, who serve as part-time instructors, do not need training in how to teach. A part-time faculty member in a professional field at Southern, for example, explained that part-time faculty are often hired on the basis on their professional expertise, but they receive very little guidance in terms of how to teach. “New part-time faculty come here with professional expertise, but no one talks to them about teaching. They are told what to teach, but nothing in terms of professional development.”

## **Part One: Finding 12**

### **Part-Time Faculty: Course Load Limits**

Part-time faculty voiced opposition toward the CSU system's cap on the number of courses that they can teach each semester. In particular, part-time faculty who teach at multiple institutions to earn a living wage indicated that they would prefer to teach more at their respective CSU institution, rather than scatter their energies and travel time across more campuses. Current policies, however, preclude them from teaching more than two courses per semester.

A department chair in arts and sciences at Southern argued that the course load limits force part-time faculty to work at multiple institutions, when they would prefer to work more extensively at one location. When part-time faculty are scattered across multiple institutions, the quality of their teaching may suffer.

The union contract specifies that they can only teach a maximum of two courses at any given campus. The result is that they generally teach several courses at several different institutions. I think it makes it very hard for them to be good teachers because they have too many students, and they are not all even on one campus. Also, [the course load limits] make it necessary for us to hire a large number of part-timers... One of the problems is we've got so many part-timers. It's really hard to have a coherent program when you've got so many different people teaching.

A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences at Southern explained how part-time faculty could serve as a greater resource for departments, if they were able to contribute more than teaching two courses per semester: "There have been times when the department was stretched to cover courses, and I would have been willing to take on more. I think it's actually more of a limiting factor for the university than it is for the part-time faculty."

Some study participants believed that the rationale for the current policy was a misguided attempt to establish equity for part-time faculty. A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences at Western argued that "the union should raise the ceiling so that we can earn more. I guess the teaching limits are supposed to spread out the workload among all the available adjuncts, but there are many of us who could and want to teach more."

Moreover, part-time faculty are not allowed to carry overloads. While full-time faculty are able to accumulate load credits in excess of 12 per semester, and then apply the excess credits toward workloads in future semesters, part-time faculty are not able to do likewise. As a part-time faculty member in the social sciences at Eastern explained, "Even if I advise a student in an independent study or do some other activity like write an accreditation piece or something like that, there is no way that they can give me any more than the [load] credits allowed in the contract. There is no additional compensation, no additional reward."

## **Part One: Finding 13**

### **Supporting Librarians as Academic Professionals**

Across the four CSU institutions, librarians sought greater recognition for their work as academic professionals. Specifically, they asked for:

- More flexibility in work schedules and less emphasis on documenting work through time sheets
- More recognition by promotion and tenure committees of their unique contributions to the academic life of their respective universities
- More cooperation from information technology units, whose functions are integral to the work of librarians

#### **Work schedule flexibility**

Some librarians expressed concerns regarding autonomy in the workplace, and they argued that the administration has treated them more like hourly employees, rather than as academic professionals. A study participant at Southern explained that librarians are required to complete time sheets, which reinforces a “punch-in, punch-out mentality,” and diminishes the professional status of librarians.

At Eastern, several librarians noted that flex time is permitted in the collective bargaining agreement, but administrators continue to block their use of it. These librarians argued that working longer hours during the semesters, and shorter hours during the breaks, would be a more effective use of their time. Furthermore, a librarian at Southern argued that the university conflates flex time with comp time. Flex time provides the employee with the option of structuring the hours for starting and leaving work each day, while comp time provides time off work in lieu of overtime pay. “Human Resources has conflated flex time with comp time, even though the contract says they are separate.” As an example, this study participant mentioned that:

We are often asked to provide instruction at night for evening classes. Also, some students, especially graduate students, tend to only be available in the evening or on weekends. If they need help for those times, then I need to receive approval from the library director before I can take comp time. The teaching faculty would never be asked to do that.

#### **Promotion and tenure reviews**

Tenure-stream librarians are evaluated by the same university-wide promotion and tenure committee as the teaching faculty. Some librarians questioned whether university P&T committees, which are comprised nearly entirely of teaching faculty, would be sufficiently knowledgeable to evaluate the performance of librarians.

Librarians explained that their “creative activity” may not appear similar to that of the teaching faculty. A librarian at Eastern noted that “most librarians use a bibliography that they put together, or an

elaborate web page, or a column in a newsletter, as evidence of creative activity. Unlike the teaching faculty, we don't have summers to write journal articles [due to librarians' 12-month contract]." Another librarian at Eastern described the potential complications that may arise in a promotion and tenure review for a librarian: "I know that the [P&T] committee has access to the list of criteria for librarians, but I wonder whether they actually understand what librarians do and how the criteria are prioritized differently. When there is a large number of faculty going up for promotion and tenure, and only a handful of librarians going up, it is possible that the different standards are lost sight of, and that librarians are penalized for not having enough creative activity."

### **Coordination with information technology units**

Librarians mentioned that their work is increasingly linked to complex information technology systems. As a librarian at Central noted, "information technology is changing. That makes work stimulating but also challenging, because you have to keep up with the technology." This level of complexity creates an imperative for libraries and information technology units to coordinate their operations and work collaboratively to provide appropriate intellectual resources for students and faculty. Yet, study participants described instances of conflict or tension between libraries and IT units. Specifically, librarians argued that IT units maintain such tight control over systems and servers that innovation is stifled. A full-time librarian at Western, for example, noted that the IT unit on that campus is "unwilling to give up any control. There are people in the library who can do some of the computer work, but University Computing is unwilling to let them do it. But then, they don't do it either. So it is a constant struggle."

## Part One: Finding 14

### Acknowledging the Work of Coaches and Trainers

Coaches and trainers described a demanding workload, which they believe is not well understood by other constituencies within their respective universities. A full-time coach at Western, for example, argued that coaches work longer hours than faculty, yet their contributions to the university are often ignored.

I know coaches put in a lot more time than people would assume or understand... so professors put in a certain amount of hours, and as coaches, we put in three times as many hours. There is no coach here that has a 40 hour work week. That would be a short week. We are working between 50 and 75 hours being on campus. There is no overtime or anything.

Similarly, a full-time coach at Central indicated that the collective bargaining agreement does not reflect the realities of their workloads.

There is no understanding of what work hours mean for coaches. Faculty have a limited number of work hours, for classes and office hours. But coaches work during the week and weekends due to games and practices and travel time. The contract reflects this lack of understanding. For example, how you calculate vacation and sick time comes into play, since the standard work week and all the related paperwork does not reflect all the weekend work that coaches put in.

Another full-time coach at Central called for greater flexibility in accounting for hours worked. "If the coaches work 60 hours during the week and then try to take some time off the next week, they sometimes have to take sick time, since the timesheets do not allow flexibility. And people get upset, saying that the coaches aren't here."

Coaches also indicated that they are expected to be increasingly involved in promoting student learning. As a full-time coach at Western noted, "We have seen more emphasis on working with the student-athlete to see growth in them as a whole, not just on the athletic side, but also the academic side." Study participants endorsed this more holistic approach to working with student-athletes, but they indicated that such efforts have significant workload implications.

The workloads of trainers are also extensive, given that they must cover all practices and competitions, as well as travel with teams for events at other institutions. As a trainer at Central explained, "We can't set a limit on our work hours. We can't refuse to cover [an event or practice], because that would make the university liable for injuries." Trainers also indicated that their work hours are highly variable, given last-minute changes to practice schedules.

Some trainers at Central and Southern have joint appointments; they serve as trainers in the athletic department, and as faculty in an exercise science academic program. These trainers indicated that their dual appointment strengthens both the academic program and the athletics training services, yet this arrangement creates workload challenges. Specifically, the extensive demands of athletics training conflict with expectations to produce research and scholarship within the academic field.

## Part One: Finding 15

### Fostering Professional Growth for Counselors

Across the four CSU institutions, counselors expressed the concern that current staffing levels are not sufficient to address the increasingly complex counseling needs of college students. As a full-time counselor at Central explained, “We are seeing more extreme cases and a greater need for our presence on campus... We aren’t equipped to handle these rising waters with the current number of staff.” The high demand for direct counseling services, moreover, prevents counselors from engaging in prevention and outreach work. A full-time counselor at Eastern, for example, argued that “we ought to be organizing more outreach programs, attending events so that students get to know us outside the office. We need to address more than just the needs of the students who come to our door. We need to be preventive and proactive.”

Counselors also indicated that the CSU AAUP contract is not flexible enough to permit them to teach courses, even though several counselors expressed a strong interest in teaching and could make significant contributions to academic programs. A counselor at Southern noted that half of the counseling staff at that institution are AAUP members, while half are AFSCME members. The AFSCME members have more flexibility in their contract, according to study participants.

The AAUP has a work hour stipulation. I can’t officially work beyond that number of hours... So if I were to teach, I would need to get released from my regular work to do so. But that’s not really possible, due to the high case load. I would love to teach, but I am not able to do so. But my AFSCME colleagues can teach beyond 4:30 [when the counseling office closes] and they are regarded as part-time AAUP members to do that.

This study participant from Southern argued for more flexibility in counselors’ work schedules.

As AAUP members, we have no flexibility with our schedule. So if I work late one night doing a program for the residence halls, then I cannot come in late the next morning or adjust it at some time, since I can’t take comp time for it, but my AFSCME colleagues can do that for the same activity.

Furthermore, counselors noted two concerns regarding the promotion and tenure process. First, they questioned whether their scholarly work would be viewed as legitimate by university committees. As a counselor at Southern explained, “The creative activity that we undertake is very different from that of teaching faculty... In the last ten years, not a single counselor from any of the four [CSU] campuses has been given sabbatical leave. In the cases that I know about, the applications were denied on the grounds that the proposed project was not research-oriented enough.” Likewise, a full-time counselor at Central argued that “when counselors face the promotion and tenure committee, they [teaching faculty] don’t have a clue what we [counselors] do.”

Second, counselors noted that their Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC) consists of only one person: the director of the counseling center. The small size of the counseling center does not permit the formation of a full DEC. A full-time counselor at Southern described the dilemma that this scenario presents: “So the evaluation of AAUP counselors goes from the supervisory chain of command to faculty peers. But the supervisors are not part of AAUP, and the faculty peers do not know anything about the type of work counselors do. So it is a very challenging situation.”

## Part Two

### Survey Findings: Part-Time Faculty

#### Part-time faculty characteristics

Among the part-time CSU faculty, more than one-third were teaching at multiple institutions. Approximately two-thirds of the part-time faculty held non-faculty jobs, in addition to their teaching work at a CSU institution. More than half of the part-time faculty would have preferred a full-time faculty position at a CSU institution, although only 30.5% of these part-time faculty held doctoral or first-professional degrees.

In addition to your part-time faculty job at this institution, do you teach courses at any other college or university?	Yes	37.4%
	No	62.6%

In addition to your work as a part-time faculty member, do you hold another full-time or part-time job (not including other part-time faculty jobs)?	Yes	65.7%
	No	34.3%

Would you have preferred a full-time faculty position at this institution?	Yes	55.6%
	No	44.4%

Among those who would have preferred a full-time position, what is the highest degree you have completed?	Bachelor's degree	3.2%
	Master's degree	66.3%
	Doctoral degree	28.4%
	First-professional degree (e.g., MD, JD)	2.1%

### Average work week for part-time faculty

Part-time faculty in the CSU system worked fewer hours per week for the institution than the national average for part-time faculty at “public master’s I” institutions (13.9 hours versus 16.7 hours). The difference may be attributable to the teaching load limits placed on part-time faculty in the CSU system.

	Paid work for institution	Unpaid work for institution	External work, paid	External work, unpaid	Total
<b>CSU Part-Time Faculty</b>	10.7	3.2	16.1	1.9	31.9
<b>National average</b>	14.9	1.8	19.2	2.5	38.4

### Undergraduate teaching practices of part-time faculty

CSU part-time faculty members were more likely than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions to use the following teaching practices:

- essay exams
- short-answer exams
- research papers and writing assignments
- assessing multiple drafts of students’ written work

CSU part-time faculty members were less likely than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions to use the following teaching practices.

- laboratory, shop, or studio assignments
- service-learning or co-op experiences

Thus, CSU part-time faculty are using some pedagogical practices (research papers, multiple drafts of written work) that research has shown to be associated with higher levels of student learning. On the other hand, the more extensive use of short-answer exams by CSU part-time faculty may indicate that they are not using a wide array of approaches to assess student learning. Also, the limited use of laboratory assignments and service-learning projects may be inconsistent with the pedagogical needs of various academic programs.

CSU part-time faculty members used multiple-choice exams in their courses at rates comparable to (within 5% of) the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Multiple-choice exams</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	32.1%	26.4%	41.5%
National average, part-time faculty	46.7%	10.4%	42.9%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>36.6%</b>	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>47.3%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members were **more likely** to use essay exams in their courses than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Essay exams</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	31.9%	30.8%	37.3%
National average, part-time faculty	43.7%	9.0%	47.4%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>45.4%</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>42.3%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members were **more likely** to use short-answer exams in their courses than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Short-answer exams</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	33.4%	31.9%	34.8%
National average, part-time faculty	45.1%	9.3%	45.5%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members were **more likely** to use term/research papers and writing assignments in their courses than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Term/research papers and writing assignments</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	49.2%	33.1%	17.7%
National average, part-time faculty	61.8%	8.4%	29.8%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>55.6%</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members were **more likely** to assess multiple drafts of students’ written work than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Multiple drafts of written work</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	21.0%	26.5%	52.5%
National average, part-time faculty	24.0%	6.8%	69.1%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>26.2%</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	<b>55.4%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members had students deliver presentations in their courses at rates comparable to (within 5% of) the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Oral presentations</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	33.5%	34.4%	32.1%
National average, part-time faculty	46.8%	10.7%	42.6%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>37.1%</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>38.6%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members had students work on group and team projects at rates comparable to (within 5% of) the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Group and team projects</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	28.1%	31.2%	40.6%
National average, part-time faculty	38.3%	10.7%	51.0%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>49.6%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members had students evaluate and provide feedback on each other’s work at rates comparable to (within 5% of) the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Student evaluations of each other’s work</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	18.7%	22.0%	59.2%
National average, part-time faculty	29.3%	7.2%	63.5%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>20.9%</b>	<b>61.2%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members were **less likely** to use laboratory, shop, or studio assignments in their courses than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Laboratory, shop, or studio assignments</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	23.8%	22.5%	53.7%
National average, part-time faculty	30.6%	6.4%	63.0%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>72.1%</b>

CSU part-time faculty members were **less likely** to incorporate service-learning or co-op experiences into their courses than the national average for part-time faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

<b>Service-learning or co-op experiences requiring interactions with the community or business/industry</b>			
	All Classes	Some classes	Not used
National average, full-time faculty	10.5%	19.4%	70.1%
National average, part-time faculty	17.4%	6.9%	75.6%
<b>CSU part-time faculty</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>

### Part-time faculty: Innovations in teaching

The spring 2009 part-time faculty survey identified those individuals who had taught at their respective CSU institution for two years or more. Among these part-time faculty members, large majorities had made changes to their courses, over the previous two years, to enhance student learning. Some of these teaching innovations included:

- experimenting with new pedagogies (83.4%)
- changing teaching practices to get students more involved in their own learning (76.3%)
- revising syllabi to devote more attention to building students' academic skills (63.3%)
- incorporating new instructional technologies into teaching practices (61.1%)
- changing class readings and discussion topics to include more perspectives from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds and traditions (60.5%)

Over the previous two years, 63.3% of CSU part-time faculty members have revised their syllabi to devote more attention to building students' academic skills.

Revised syllabus to devote more attention to building students' academic skills in reading, writing, or math	Did this for all of my courses	46.1%
	Did this for some of my courses	17.2%
	Not necessary or relevant to my courses	35.2%
	Did not do this, lack of time	1.6%
	Did not do this, lack of support or professional development	0.0%

Over the previous two years, 76.3% of CSU part-time faculty members have changed their teaching practices to get students more involved in their own learning.

Changed teaching practices to get students more involved in their own learning (e.g., through hands-on projects, group work, student-led presentations)	Did this for all of my courses	54.3%
	Did this for some of my courses	22.0%
	Not necessary or relevant to my courses	20.5%
	Did not do this, lack of time	2.4%
	Did not do this, lack of support or professional development	0.8%

Over the previous two years, 60.5% of CSU part-time faculty members have incorporated more perspectives from diverse cultural or ethnic traditions into their courses.

Changed class readings and discussion topics to include more perspectives from different cultural or ethnic backgrounds and traditions	Did this for all of my courses	44.4%
	Did this for some of my courses	16.1%
	Not necessary or relevant to my courses	36.3%
	Did not do this, lack of time	2.4%
	Did not do this, lack of support or professional development	0.8%

Over the previous two years, 83.4% of CSU part-time faculty members have experimented with new teaching approaches.

Experimented with new teaching approaches	Did this for all of my courses	54.0%
	Did this for some of my courses	29.4%
	Not necessary or relevant to my courses	14.3%
	Did not do this, lack of time	0.8%
	Did not do this, lack of support or professional development	1.6%

Over the previous two years, 45.6% of CSU part-time faculty members substantially revised their syllabi to reflect major changes in their academic fields or disciplines.

Substantially revised syllabus to reflect significant changes in my discipline or field (not just updating the readings, but re-envisioning the course based on new developments in the field or discipline)	Did this for all of my courses	24.0%
	Did this for some of my courses	21.6%
	Not necessary or relevant to my courses	47.2%
	Did not do this, lack of time	6.4%
	Did not do this, lack of support or professional development	0.8%

Over the previous two years, 61.1% of CSU part-time faculty members incorporated new instructional technologies into their teaching practices.

Incorporated new technologies into my teaching practices (e.g., web sites, blogs)	Did this for all of my courses	39.7%
	Did this for some of my courses	21.4%
	Not necessary or relevant to my courses	28.6%
	Did not do this, lack of time	6.3%
	Did not do this, lack of support or professional development	4.0%

Over the previous two years, 36.8% of CSU part-time faculty members revised their syllabi to bring courses into alignment with external expectations associated with accreditation or professional licensure.

Revised syllabus to bring course into alignment with external expectations associated with accreditation or professional licensure	Did this for all of my courses	24.0%
	Did this for some of my courses	12.8%
	Not necessary or relevant to my courses	56.8%
	Did not do this, lack of time	0.0%
	Did not do this, lack of support or professional development	6.4%

### The work environment for part-time faculty

CSU part-time faculty reported satisfaction levels that were **lower than** the national average for part-time faculty at “public master’s I” institutions for the following dimensions of the work environment:

- Institutional support for instructional technology
- Institutional support for teaching improvement
- Workload (which may be attributable to the teaching load limits for part-time faculty in the CSU system)

They were also **less likely** than the national average to agree that:

- Faculty at this institution are rewarded for good teaching
- Women faculty members are treated fairly at this institution
- Part-time faculty are treated fairly at this institution

Note: satisfaction level includes both “very satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied” responses, while dissatisfaction level includes both “very dissatisfied” and “somewhat dissatisfied” responses.

Note: agreement level includes both “agree strongly” and “agree somewhat” responses, while disagreement level includes both “disagree strongly” and “disagree somewhat” responses.

		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
The authority you have to make decisions about the content and teaching methods in your instructional activities	National average, full-time faculty	77.8%	17.9%	3.6%	0.7%
	National average, part-time faculty	77.1%	18.3%	3.4%	1.2%
	CSU part-time faculty	77.8%	18.1%	2.1%	2.1%

		Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities (teaching with technology)	National average, full-time faculty	43.0%	42.4%	11.3%	3.3%
	National average, part-time faculty	50.0%	39.6%	7.6%	2.7%
	CSU Part-time Faculty	33.6%	42.1%	15.7%	8.6%

		<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>
Institutional support for teaching improvement (including grants, release time, and professional development funds)	National average, full-time faculty	23.9%	40.8%	25.1%	10.2%
	National average, part-time faculty	33.9%	44.8%	14.6%	6.7%
	CSU Part-time Faculty	18.1%	47.8%	21.7%	12.3%

		<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>
Your workload	National average, full-time faculty	24.0%	40.8%	24.8%	10.4%
	National average, part-time faculty	51.5%	35.2%	9.4%	4.0%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	40.3%	39.6%	15.3%	4.9%

		<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>
Your salary	National average, full-time faculty	13.9%	39.5%	28.0%	18.5%
	National average, part-time faculty	20.7%	38.1%	24.5%	16.7%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	21.0%	40.6%	17.5%	21.0%

		<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>
The benefits available to you	National average, full-time faculty	29.5%	45.3%	18.3%	6.9%
	National average, part-time faculty	21.4%	31.7%	23.5%	23.4%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	20.0%	34.3%	20.7%	25.0%

		<b>Very satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very dissatisfied</b>
Your job at this institution, overall	National average, full-time faculty	36.2%	48.4%	12.3%	3.0%
	National average, part-time faculty	50.3%	40.5%	7.0%	2.3%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	40.6%	49.0%	8.4%	2.1%

		<b>Agree Strongly</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Strongly</b>
Faculty at this institution are rewarded for good teaching.	National average, full-time faculty	25.1%	50.6%	16.6%	7.7%
	National average, part-time faculty	36.7%	42.6%	14.5%	6.2%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	13.8%	51.4%	24.6%	10.1%

		<b>Agree Strongly</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Strongly</b>
Women faculty members are treated fairly at this institution.	National average, full-time faculty	50.9%	35.5%	10.4%	3.2%
	National average, part-time faculty	59.0%	33.4%	5.8%	1.8%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	46.3%	39.6%	9.7%	4.5%

		<b>Agree Strongly</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Strongly</b>
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups are treated fairly at this institution.	National average, full-time faculty	50.9%	36.9%	9.3%	2.9%
	National average, part-time faculty	55.8%	37.2%	5.9%	1.0%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	45.3%	44.5%	7.8%	2.3%

		<b>Agree Strongly</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree Strongly</b>
Part-time faculty are treated fairly at this institution.	National average, full-time faculty	19.1%	40.3%	26.3%	14.3%
	National average, part-time faculty	36.6%	33.3%	19.7%	10.4%
	CSU Part-Time Faculty	24.8%	35.5%	23.4%	16.3%

The majority of CSU part-time faculty were satisfied with the level of institutional support to experiment with new teaching approaches (65.9%), and were satisfied with secretarial support services (76.4%). But they were dissatisfied with job security (54.9%) and office space/equipment (60.7%).

CSU Part-Time Faculty	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Institutional support to experiment with new teaching approaches	32.6%	33.3%	22.7%	11.3%
Office space and equipment	10.7%	28.6%	25.0%	35.7%
Support services (secretarial and/or professional staff support)	42.4%	34.0%	12.5%	11.1%
Job security	14.1%	31.0%	22.5%	32.4%

CSU part-time faculty disagreed (65.9%) that their institutions provide training for new part-time faculty before they teach. They agreed (85.4%) that part-time faculty have limited job security at their respective institutions.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
Part-time faculty are given specific training before teaching at this institution.	11.6%	22.5%	27.5%	38.4%
Part-time faculty have limited job security at this institution.	49.7%	35.7%	11.2%	3.5%
Part-time faculty are respected by the full-time faculty at this institution.	24.8%	41.1%	17.7%	16.3%
Part-time faculty primarily teach introductory courses at this institution.	43.2%	34.5%	17.3%	5.0%

## Part Three

### Librarians: Survey Findings

CSU AAUP provided email addresses for 80 librarians (57 full-time, 23 part-time). Surveys were delivered electronically to these librarians in the spring 2010 semester. The overall response rate was 43.8%.

	Total in group	Responses	Response rate
Full-time Librarians	57	29	50.9%
Part-time Librarians	23	6	26.1%
Librarians: All	80	35	43.8%

#### Hours worked per week

Full-time librarians reported an average work week of 37.2 hours, while part-time librarians reported an average work week of 22.4 hours.

#### The work environment

CSU librarians reported the highest levels of **dissatisfaction** with the following dimensions of the work environment:

- time available for research, creative, and other scholarly activities (66.7% dissatisfied)
- institutional support for research, creative, and other scholarly activities (60.0% dissatisfied)
- time available for keeping current in your professional field (56.7% dissatisfied)

High levels of **satisfaction**, however, were reported for benefits, salary, and overall job satisfaction.

CSU Librarians: Full-time and Part-time	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not applicable
The process by which your work schedule is set	53.3%	20.0%	16.7%	10.0%	
The amount of flexibility in your work schedule	36.7%	40.0%	3.3%	20.0%	
Time available for working with students	20.0%	30.0%	16.7%	6.7%	26.7%
Time available for research, creative, and other scholarly activities	6.7%	23.3%	36.7%	30.0%	3.3%
Time available for keeping current in your professional field	10.0%	30.0%	30.0%	26.7%	3.3%
Institutional support for professional development	13.3%	40.0%	20.0%	23.3%	3.3%

CSU Librarians: Full-time and Part-time	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not applicable
Institutional support for research, creative, and other scholarly activities	6.7%	26.7%	26.7%	33.3%	6.7%
Your workload	16.7%	46.7%	23.3%	13.3%	
Your salary	26.7%	43.3%	13.3%	16.7%	
The benefits available to you	43.3%	46.7%	6.7%	0.0%	3.3%
Your job at this institution, overall	40.0%	46.7%	10.0%	3.3%	

CSU librarians reported the highest levels of **disagreement** with the following dimensions of the work environment:

- administrators at this institution consider the concerns of librarians when making policy (86.7% disagree)
- people at this institution have a clear understanding of what librarians do (83.3% disagree)
- librarians are respected by administrators at this institution (56.6% disagree)

Librarians, however, generally agreed that the criteria for promotion and tenure were clear (69.0%) and that the work environment at their university fosters a balance between work and personal life (66.6%)

CSU Librarians: Full-time and Part-time	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	Not applicable
Administrators at this institution consider the concerns of librarians when making policy	3.3%	10.0%	40.0%	46.7%	
Librarians are sufficiently involved in campus decision making	3.3%	46.7%	30.0%	20.0%	
The work environment at this institution fosters a balance between work and personal life	23.3%	43.3%	13.3%	20.0%	
Librarians are treated fairly at this institution	20.0%	33.3%	20.0%	26.7%	
Librarians are respected by the teaching faculty at this institution	13.8%	37.9%	37.9%	10.3%	

CSU Librarians: Full-time and Part-time	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	Not applicable
Librarians are respected by administrators at this institution	13.3%	30.0%	23.3%	33.3%	
People at this institution have a clear understanding of what librarians do (what their work roles are)	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	
The criteria for tenure and promotion at this institution are clear	34.5%	34.5%	17.2%	13.8%	
The criteria for tenure and promotion at this institution are a good fit with my professional interests	20.0%	43.3%	16.7%	13.3%	6.7%
Review processes for tenure and promotion at this institution appropriately account for the unique work context of librarians	20.0%	40.0%	23.3%	13.3%	3.3%

## Part Four

### Coaches and Trainers: Survey Findings

CSU AAUP provided email addresses for 121 coaches and trainers (79 full-time, 42 part-time). Surveys were delivered electronically to these coaches and trainers in the spring 2010 semester. The overall response rate was 26.4%.

	Total in group	Responses	Response rate
Full-time Coaches and Trainers	79	27	34.2%
Part-time Coaches and Trainers	42	5	11.9%
Coaches and Trainers: All	121	32	26.4%

#### Hours worked per week

Full-time coaches and trainers reported an average work week of 57.3 hours, while part-time coaches and trainers reported an average work week of 38.0 hours.

#### The work environment

Coaches and trainers in the CSU system reported the highest levels of **dissatisfaction** with the following dimensions of the work environment:

- quality of athletic fields, facilities, and venues for practice and competition (68% dissatisfied)
- institutional support for professional development (60% dissatisfied)
- support services, secretarial and/or professional staff (56% dissatisfied)

CSU Coaches and Trainers: Full-time and Part-time	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not applicable
Time available for working with student-athletes	32.0%	32.0%	28.0%	8.0%	
Institutional support for professional development	8.0%	24.0%	20.0%	40.0%	8.0%
Your workload	16.0%	40.0%	24.0%	20.0%	
Your salary	20.0%	32.0%	20.0%	28.0%	
The benefits available to you	36.0%	24.0%	20.0%	16.0%	4.0%
Job security	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	28.0%	12.0%
The quality of athletic fields, facilities, and venues for practice and competition	12.0%	20.0%	24.0%	44.0%	

CSU Coaches and Trainers: Full-time and Part-time	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not applicable
Support services (secretarial and/or professional staff support)	16.0%	28.0%	12.0%	44.0%	
Your job at this institution, overall	40.0%	28.0%	24.0%	8.0%	

CSU coaches and trainers also reported high levels of **disagreement** regarding whether:

- people at this institution have a clear understanding of what coaches and trainers do (84.0% disagree)
- review processes for promotion at this institution appropriately account for the unique work context of coaches and trainers (81.0% disagree)
- the criteria for promotion at this institution are a good fit with my professional interests (72.8% disagree)
- coaches and trainers are sufficiently involved in campus decision making (72.0% disagree)
- part-time coaches are treated fairly at this institution (69.6% disagree)

CSU Coaches: Full-time and Part-time	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
Administrators at this institution consider the concerns of coaches and trainers when making policy	4.0%	28.0%	20.0%	48.0%
Coaches and trainers are sufficiently involved in campus decision making	8.0%	20.0%	20.0%	52.0%
The work environment at this institution fosters a balance between work and personal life	4.2%	45.8%	25.0%	25.0%
Part-time coaches are treated fairly at this institution	4.3%	26.1%	17.4%	52.2%
Trainers are treated fairly at this institution	13.6%	59.1%	9.1%	18.2%
People at this institution have a clear understanding of what coaches and trainers do (what their work roles are)	4.0%	12.0%	20.0%	64.0%
The criteria for promotion at this institution are clear	4.8%	28.6%	38.1%	28.6%
The criteria for promotion at this institution are a good fit with my professional interests	0.0%	27.3%	27.3%	45.5%
Review processes for promotion at this institution appropriately account for the unique work context of coaches and trainers	0.0%	19.0%	28.6%	52.4%

## Part Five

### Counselors: Survey Findings

CSU AAUP provided email addresses for 14 counselors (11 full-time, 3 part-time). Surveys were delivered electronically to these counselors in the spring 2010 semester. The overall response rate was 50.0%. Given the small total number of responses, survey results in this section should be interpreted cautiously. Frequency counts, rather than percentages, are reported in the tables below.

	Total in group	Responses	Response rate
Full-time Counselors	11	5	45.5%
Part-time Counselors	3	2	66.7%
Counselors: All	14	7	50.0%

#### Hours worked per week

Full-time counselors reported an average work week of 43.0 hours, while part-time counselors reported an average work week of 28.5 hours.

#### The work environment

Large numbers of CSU counselors were dissatisfied with:

- time available for research, creative, and other scholarly activities; and
- institutional support for research, creative, and other scholarly activities

CSU Counselors: Full-time and Part-time	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Amount of flexibility in the work schedule	2	3	1	0
Time available for working with students	2	3	1	0
Time available for research, creative, and other scholarly activities	1	0	4	1
Time available for keeping current in your professional field	1	2	3	0
Institutional support for professional development	0	5	1	0
Institutional support for research, creative, and other scholarly activities	0	2	2	2
Your workload	2	2	2	0

CSU Counselors: Full-time and Part-time	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Your salary	4	1	1	0
The benefits available to you	5	1	0	0
Office work space/equipment	3	3	0	0
Support services (secretarial and/or professional staff support)	3	0	3	0
Your job at this institution, overall	3	3	0	0

CSU counselors reported high levels of disagreement regarding whether:

- administrators consider the concerns of counselors when making policy
- counselors are sufficiently involved in campus decision making
- people have a clear understanding of what counselors do
- the criteria for tenure and promotion are a good fit for their professional interests
- review processes for tenure and promotion appropriately account for the unique work context of counselors

CSU Counselors: Full-time and Part-time	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
Administrators at this institution consider the concerns of counselors when making policy	0	0	2	4
Counselors are sufficiently involved in campus decision making	0	0	2	4
The work environment at this institution fosters a balance between work and personal life	1	4	1	0
Counselors are treated fairly at this institution	0	3	3	0
Counselors are respected by the teaching faculty at this institution	0	5	0	1
Counselors are respected by the administration at this institution	0	1	4	1
People at this institution have a clear understanding of what counselors do (what their work roles are)	0	0	3	3

CSU Counselors: Full-time and Part-time	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
At this institution, collaboration between counselors and teaching faculty is encouraged	1	2	2	1
At this institution, collaboration between counselors and staff in the student affairs division is encouraged	1	4	1	0
The criteria for tenure and promotion at this institution are clear	0	3	3	0
The criteria for tenure and promotion at this institution are a good fit with my professional interests	0	0	2	4
Review processes for tenure and promotion at this institution appropriately account for the unique work context of counselors	0	0	2	4

## Recommendations for CSU AAUP

1. **Teaching load.** The four CSU institutions have outgrown the 4-4 teaching load. The current teaching load is, to a certain extent, an historical artifact of these universities' origins as teachers colleges. Today, however, these universities espouse broader ambitions that extend the work of faculty into new domains. Each CSU institution, through its unique mission, seeks to achieve a standard of excellence as a teaching university. In order to provide students with the highest caliber university-level education, faculty must be engaged in research that informs their teaching and that serves as the basis for offering a state-of-the-art curriculum. Faculty must also be involved in assessing student learning outcomes and in documenting academic quality in a variety of ways, including accreditation reviews where appropriate. Moreover, faculty need to have the opportunity to implement the pedagogical practices which research has shown to influence student learning within their respective fields and disciplines. These practices also include mentoring and advising.

While CSU administrators have emphasized that their universities are not striving to become major research universities, these four institutions are now pursuing broader ambitions, which have implications for faculty workloads. New initiatives in internationalization, first-year experience programs, service-learning, and student advising, for example, represent important efforts to enhance the educational options of students and to foster higher levels of retention and student success. Moreover, CSU faculty have led important efforts to strengthen their general education curricula, as well as to create new graduate program offerings to serve better emerging needs within the state and region. Rather than scale back these ambitions, the CSU institutions need to consider the workload implications of a changing university.

The current economic climate may diminish prospects for changing the 4-4 teaching load at this time. Nevertheless, university leaders and faculty members need to be engaged in an ongoing dialogue about the future of the university and the resource implications of such ambitions. If a reduction to a 3-3 or 3-4 teaching load is not feasible at this time, then university leaders and faculty members need to consider how reassigned time is allocated toward various institutional priorities. Depending on institutional priorities, additional reassigned time may be needed to support faculty research, to encourage faculty involvement in assessment, and to enable faculty to experiment with cutting-edge pedagogical practices.

2. **Faculty load credit data.** The CSU institutions are compelled to prioritize the use of resources in ways that maximize student learning. Given that faculty are the most important resource in fostering student learning, the CSU institutions need to have complete and accurate data regarding how faculty workload is distributed across various instructional and non-instructional tasks. Prior to this study, the CSU system had not provided CSU AAUP with a complete accounting of faculty load credit activity across all four institutions. Now that the CSU system has supplied complete load credit data for four consecutive academic years, this practice needs to be maintained for the benefit of all university members. These data can be used to understand how faculty workloads are currently comprised, and whether existing allocations of reassigned time need to be changed or increased in order to accommodate new initiatives. Moreover, these data could be used to benchmark faculty load credit allocations across the four CSU institutions, or to examine equity issues that may emerge among various academic departments.

In addition to maintaining a comprehensive system of reporting load credit activity, the CSU institutions should also consider collecting and reporting data on student credit hours (that is, course credit hours multiplied by course enrollments). This additional level of data would enable university members to understand how class size may affect faculty workloads in different academic departments (a sample template for gathering such data is included in the appendix to this report). These data are, in fact, essential, if the CSU institutions are to benchmark their practices against other high-caliber teaching institutions. In order to engage in benchmarking, the CSU institutions could participate in the Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (Central is already a participant in this consortium). This consortium at the University of Delaware is now considered to be the standard for comparative analysis of faculty teaching loads at the level of the academic discipline. [For more information, see [www.udel.edu/IR/cost/](http://www.udel.edu/IR/cost/).] Furthermore, the CSU institutions should also consider class size in relation to guidelines established by the scholarly associations of the various academic disciplines. Western has already incorporated this standard into its strategic plan, and the other CSU institutions would be wise to follow that course.

3. **Load credits for labs and studios.** The partial load credit allocation for labs and studios provoked perhaps the strongest workload concerns from full-time faculty. This practice assumes that laboratory instruction involves nothing more than providing students with equipment and instructions for completing a set of tasks. Contemporary pedagogy in the sciences, however, indicates a much greater level of faculty involvement in the teaching process. Moreover, the lab exercises themselves are now much more sophisticated and frequently require students to engage in problem-solving (rather than simply follow a prescribed sequence of steps). Thus, the load credit allocation needs to reflect the workload associated with current pedagogies in the sciences. A similar argument can be made for studio-based instruction. This study has identified the additional increments of supplemental lab credits that would be necessary to allocate 1.0 load credit for each hour of instruction. The CSU institutions should move quickly to correct this inadequate practice and remove any disincentive that may dissuade faculty from using effective pedagogical practices.
4. **Part-time faculty and instructional load credits.** All four CSU institutions exceeded the maximum allowable percentage of instructional load credits that could be provided by part-time faculty members. The 2007-2011 collective bargaining agreement specifies that no more than 20% of instructional load credits can be attributable to part-time faculty. Based on the data supplied for this study, the part-time faculty percentages at the CSU institutions were 32.5% at Central, 32.3% at Eastern, 42.2% at Southern, and 38.7% at Western. The discrepancy between the contractual standard and the percentages calculated for this study should be a subject for discussion between the CSU AAUP and CSU administration.
5. **Rising research expectations.** Full-time faculty at all four CSU institutions described rising research expectations for promotion and tenure. Faculty research is an essential component in efforts to provide high-caliber, university-level instruction. Yet, university leaders and P&T committee members must avoid the isomorphic trap of attempting to imitate prestigious research universities. CSU must develop the capacity to excel in research within a teaching-university framework. In order to clarify promotion and tenure criteria, each CSU institution has instructed its academic departments to create specific guidelines regarding the forms and types of faculty research that are valued in each unit. Some faculty, however, were concerned that

their department's guidelines would be dismissed, ignored, or misinterpreted by university P&T committees. A CSU-wide statement that endorses multiple forms of scholarship could establish greater confidence that P&T guidelines from all departments will be viewed as valid and legitimate by administration and by P&T committees. The CSU institutions could also establish stronger communication between departmental evaluation committees (DECs) and the university's P&T committee. Forums for discussion among DEC chairs, P&T committee members, AAUP representatives, and university administrators could help all parties understand and interpret the broad range of scholarly contributions made by CSU faculty.

Furthermore, the availability of reassigned time and sabbaticals to support research needs to be examined at all four CSU institutions. First, university members need to determine the optimal level of reassigned time that would be needed to support faculty research. Second, university members should consider alternative structures for awarding reassigned time, including multi-year blocks, which would allow faculty to pursue research projects of greater scope and significance. Southern, in fact, already awards some of its reassigned time for research in multi-year increments. Third, the CSU institutions should benchmark their sabbatical practices against other premier teaching universities, and determine whether additional sabbaticals are warranted.

6. **Support for junior faculty.** Tenure-track assistant professors in the CSU system expressed significant concerns regarding their need to achieve excellence in teaching, to advance their research agendas, and to serve on university committees and task forces. These junior faculty reported high levels of stress, lack of work-life balance, and anxiety regarding expectations for promotion and tenure. Some CSU institutions have attempted to alleviate these concerns by providing junior faculty with a course load reduction during their first year on campus, but this practice has been inconsistent and not available to all new faculty. CSU should establish a standard practice for providing course load reductions to all new junior faculty members.
7. **Support for department chairs.** Academic department chairs occupy increasingly complex roles within the CSU system. As each university's ambitions grow and as new academic initiatives are implemented, more and more tasks and responsibilities are allocated to department chairs. Furthermore, many administrative offices in the CSU institutions appear to lack sufficient capacity to support the work of chairs. The CSU institutions need to determine what types of institutional infrastructures are necessary to support the work of department chairs. Universities may need to hire additional support staff or establish offices to support assessment and accreditation efforts within the academic departments. Some CSU institutions may choose to create new departmental leadership structures that include associate department chairs and/or graduate and undergraduate program coordinators. These positions will need additional reassigned time so that departments can not only perform necessary administrative functions, but also contribute to institution-wide efforts to promote academic program quality. Finally, additional training should be provided for department chairs. This training should extend beyond an orientation to the university's bureaucratic forms and processes. Instead, department chairs should have access to leadership training that advances their capacity to contribute to the university as a whole.
8. **Transparency in the allocation of non-instructional load credits.** Across the four CSU institutions, faculty expressed concerns regarding transparency and equity in the allocation of non-instructional load credits. The frequent use of side letters and special workload

arrangements for certain faculty and/or departments may be eroding faculty confidence in the load credit system. In order to establish transparency in the allocation of non-instructional load credits, the CSU institutions should establish a process whereby university administrators report annually on the non-instructional assignments of faculty members. Eastern, in fact, already has such a practice in place. All non-instructional assignments and their respective load credit allocations can be listed in an annual report. When such a report is distributed, faculty would be able to call attention to activities for which they are not receiving load credits, but for which other faculty are receiving load credits for comparable work. In this way, faculty can advocate for greater equity in the allocation of non-instructional load credits, and administrators can address specific cases and seek to align comparable tasks with similar amounts of load credit.

9. **Strengthening faculty development offerings.** All four CSU institutions have centers or offices that provide in-house seminars and workshops for faculty development. These offerings should be linked clearly to the existing needs of faculty members. Thus, each of the four CSU institutions should engage in a needs assessment regarding what faculty members view to be their most pressing needs for faculty development. The results of the needs assessment should inform the types of workshops and seminars offered at each institution. Furthermore, the CSU institutions should attempt to engage junior faculty more extensively in faculty development activities. Each CSU institution could establish each year a voluntary seminar for faculty on college teaching. Faculty would receive reassigned time to participate in a year-long or semester-long seminar on college teaching and learning. The seminar could be led by a faculty member on campus who has been recognized for excellence in teaching. Faculty seminar members would explore the research literature on college teaching, experiment with new teaching approaches in their courses, and seek feedback from the group on the results of their practice. Many other universities have implemented these seminars (also known as “faculty learning groups”) to revitalize their efforts to promote faculty development.
10. **Faculty hiring practices.** The academic job market is highly competitive, and the CSU institutions need to take more aggressive actions to ensure that they are able to recruit and retain faculty of the highest caliber. University administrators and faculty leaders need to develop clear timelines and procedures for approving and implementing faculty searches. Related timelines may need to commence during the summer, so that faculty positions can be advertised early in the fall. As such, search committee chairs may need to shift some of their work to the summer (primarily August) in order to meet these benchmarks. Moreover, these chairs need additional secretarial support for coordinating the search process (such support might be provided through a central office, rather than by department secretaries who may not be able to accommodate additional responsibilities). Furthermore, as the CSU institutions emerge from a hiring freeze, decisions regarding the allocation of new faculty lines should be guided by a faculty hiring plan, which seeks to allocate faculty lines in relation to the institution’s long-term priorities. Faculty leaders should be involved in the process of determining these faculty hiring priorities. Finally, university leaders should consider the concerns voiced by faculty in the fields of business, science, and technology, who described failed searches due to the lack of competitive salaries. The CSU institutions should benchmark faculty salaries against data from comparable institutions for each academic discipline.
11. **Supporting part-time faculty members.** The CSU institutions need to engage part-time faculty more fully in departmental discussions of curriculum and student learning. Part-time faculty, however, reported that they are largely disconnected from matters within their departments.

Part-time faculty indicated that their teaching was seldom evaluated (other than student course evaluations), and the lack of evaluation deprived them of the opportunity to talk with chairs and other faculty about their teaching. All four CSU institutions need to examine their evaluation processes for part-time faculty, as well as tailor professional development and orientation sessions to the unique needs of these instructors.

**12. Benchmarking practices that affect librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors.**

Professionalism was a key theme across these groups. Librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors expressed a desire to be treated as academic professionals, yet they described instances in which their autonomy and expertise were not respected by university administrators. They described a “time clock” mentality in which administrators treated them as hourly employees, rather than as academic professionals. In order to promote professionalism, the CSU institutions need to compare their policies and practices regarding librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors. Policies regarding schedule flexibility (e.g., flex time) could be a focal point for an initial examination of work context issues across the four campuses.

# Appendix

## Data Collection Templates: Student Credit Hours, Course Credit Hours

**Form 1: Institution level - Student Credit Hours**

CSU institution:

Data Point	Year	Full-Time Faculty			Part-Time Faculty				University Total	
		FT Faculty headcount	total UG SCH	total GR SCH	PT Faculty headcount	PT Faculty FTE	total UG SCH	total GR SCH	total UG SCH	total GR SCH
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										

Notes:

- 1 - Full-time faculty headcount should be adjusted for sabbatical and leaves
- 2 - UG = undergraduate, GR = graduate
- 3 - SCH = student credit hours: calculate as the number of enrolled students multiplied by the number of course credit hours
- 4 - Part-time faculty FTE per institutional definition for FTE

**CSU Workload Data Collection**

**Form 2: Department level - Student Credit Hours**

**CSU institution:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ (complete a separate form for each academic department)

Data Point	Year	Full-Time Faculty			Part-Time Faculty				Department Total	
		FT Faculty headcount	total UG SCH	total GR SCH	PT Faculty headcount	PT Faculty FTE	total UG SCH	total GR SCH	total UG SCH	total GR SCH
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										

**Notes:**

- 1 - Department full-time faculty headcount should be adjusted for sabbatical and leaves
- 2 - UG = undergraduate, GR = graduate
- 3 - SCH = student credit hours: calculate as the number of enrolled students multiplied by the number of course credit hours
- 4 - Part-time faculty FTE per institutional definition for FTE

**Form 3: Institution level - Course Credit Hours**

**CSU institution:** \_\_\_\_\_

Data Point	Year	Full-Time Faculty			Part-Time Faculty				University Total	
		FT Faculty headcount	total UG course credit hours	total GR course credit hours	PT Faculty headcount	PT Faculty FTE	total UG course credit hours	total GR course credit hours	total UG course credit hours	total GR course credit hours
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										

**Notes:**

- 1 - Full-time faculty headcount should be adjusted for sabbatical and leaves
- 2 - UG = undergraduate, GR = graduate
- 3 - Course credit hours = total credit hour value of courses
- 4 - Part-time faculty FTE per institutional definition for FTE

**CSU Workload Data Collection**  
**Form 4: Department level - Course Credit Hours**

**CSU institution:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** \_\_\_\_\_ (complete a separate form for each academic department)

Data Point	Year	Full-Time Faculty			Part-Time Faculty				Department Total	
		FT Faculty headcount	total UG course credit hours	total GR course credit hours	PT Faculty headcount	PT Faculty FTE	total UG course credit hours	total GR course credit hours	total UG course credit hours	total GR course credit hours
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										

**Notes:**

- 1 - Department full-time faculty headcount should be adjusted for sabbatical and leaves
- 2 - UG = undergraduate, GR = graduate
- 3 - Course credit hours = total credit hour value of courses
- 4 - Part-time faculty FTE per institutional definition for FTE