

The background features abstract, overlapping green geometric shapes in various shades, creating a modern and dynamic visual effect. The shapes are primarily triangles and polygons, some semi-transparent, layered on a white background.

REPORT: THE RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR OPTIMAL TEACHING, RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES, AND SERVICE UNDER A SEMESTER SYSTEM

Subcommittee of the EPRC:

Mary Boland (Chair), Kim Cousins, Joseph Jesunathada, Robert Ricco, and Barbara Sirotnik

Mission

- To examine workload balance in light of semester conversion and the professional opportunities and demands offered by CSUSB's new Strategic Plan.
- To ensure that all tenure stream faculty have *the same baseline opportunity* to pursue innovative teaching and professional work.

How we currently fare in the CSU

Insights from the 2013 CSU Hoover Commission Responses
and the 2003 Comparable Workload Study

CSU teaching load for tenure-stream faculty

- ▶ 12 WTU per term for direct instruction
- ▶ 3 WTU per term to indirect instructional activities.

HOURS WORKED BY CSU FACULTY

CSU estimates faculty work 50 hours per week, with between 11 and 15 hours dedicated to non-instructional service and professional development work.

HOW DO WE FARE COMPARATIVELY?

The 2003 Comparable Workload Study:

- ▶ We work an average of 3 hours more per week.
- ▶ We spend approximately 8 hours more per week on teaching and service, regardless of released time.
- ▶ While comparable faculties work fewer hours, they spend more of them on research, scholarship, and creative activities.
- ▶ Comparable faculties have a higher proportion of professional success than CSU faculty.

The background features abstract, overlapping geometric shapes in various shades of green, ranging from light lime to dark forest green. These shapes are primarily located on the right side of the slide, creating a modern, layered effect. The main text is centered on a white background.

Workload and faculty success under the new strategic plan

The challenge of too much and too little...

Example: High Impact Practices

Goal 1, Objective 1: Implementing HIPS including *one HIP within the context of each students' major.*

Strategy 1.1: acknowledges the need for faculty time in implementing these methods initially, but provides little funding for doing so.

Concerns:

Nothing in the Strategic Plan acknowledges the *ongoing time* necessary to effectively execute these activities, including effective evaluation of student work.

What are HIPS?

- ▶ First-Year Seminars and Experiences
- ▶ Common Intellectual Experiences
- ▶ Learning Communities
- ▶ Writing-Intensive Courses
- ▶ Collaborative Assignments and Projects
- ▶ Undergraduate Research
- ▶ Diversity Courses/Global Learning
- ▶ Service Learning/Community-Based Learning
- ▶ Internships
- ▶ Capstone Courses and Projects

EXAMPLE: Increased Expectations for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

Goal 2 (Faculty/Staff Success), Objectives 2, 3 and 4: expansion of research, including interdisciplinary efforts, enhanced scholarship overall, and mentoring students in research and creative activities.

Goal 3 (Resources), Objective 5: expects a 25% increase in grants and contracts by 2020.

Concerns:

Increases in teaching demands will likely give a *decrease* in R/S/CA.

Plan provides little in the way of resources to support faculty.

Goals for TT hiring = more faculty competing for those resources.

Hu & Gill study: the primary predictor of research success is time for research. Negative correlations found between research productivity and increases in teaching or service load.

Mentoring students in R & CA requires dedicated time that SP does not recognize.

EXAMPLE: Increasing and Maintaining Tenure Stream Faculty Numbers

- ▶ Goal 2.7 Objective 7: Increasing Tenure Track Density (TTD) and decreasing Student to Faculty Ratio (SFR).
- ▶ Strategy 3: To reach 63 % TTD and an SFR of 23.8 in five years, CSUSB should create a culture that supports healthy work-life balance to attract and retain faculty.

CONCERNS:

Research shows that it takes only *1 additional unit* of stress to increase the likelihood of leaving a present position.

Stress = service demands, teaching loads, work with underprepared students, institutional red tape, lack of personal time, and difficulty balancing research, scholarship or creative activities with other demands.

Opportunities for increased research productivity are a major factor in TT leaving for other institutions.

17% of CSUSB's new hires between 2010 and 2014 have already left.

Workload in the quarter to semester conversion:

Possible configurations and implications

What's happening at other semester CSUs?

- ▶ Baseline = maximum # of courses a TT faculty member is expected to teach (without course releases)
- ▶ A survey of 17 schools showed faculty teaching a baseline of 6, 7 or 8 courses per year.
 - ▶ 9 had 3/3
 - ▶ 8 had 4/4
 - ▶ 1 had 4/3

How might workload increase under 4-4?

Consider these metrics:

- ▶ The combined number of students enrolled in all courses during a term
- ▶ The number of students coming to office hours at any one time
- ▶ The number of exams/papers/projects which must be graded concurrently
- ▶ The number of course preparations during a particular time period
- ▶ The number of class session preparations which must be completed per teaching day
- ▶ The pedagogical approach used and the related means of assessment and mentoring involved

Moving from 3-3-3 to 4-4 would increase faculty workload by 33%.

- ▶ 1.33 x the # of weekly preparations: a 2 day a week schedule moves from 6 class to 8 class preps per week. 3 day a week schedule moves from 9 to 12 class preps per week.
- ▶ 1.33 x the # of students at any one time.
- ▶ 1.33 x the amount of grading.

Sub-Committee RECOMMENDATION:

TT faculty members should be required to teach no more than three courses per semester.

PREFERRED MODEL: 3/3-unit classes per semester

- ▶ Reduction in contact hours = increased opportunity for professional development and the implementation of HIPS in classrooms.
- ▶ Allows the curriculum to be designed around a healthy 40 course graduation requirement (120 units).
- ▶ Facilitates parity across lower division and upper division courses and teaching loads
- ▶ Facilitates transfer curriculum alignment.
- ▶ Should be possible despite 12/3 contract conventions as CBA officially did away with the 12/3 “rule” in 1995.
- ▶ Exceptions for specific courses could still be made as needed (i.e. lab classes, graduate classes, etc.)

Alternate Model: 3/4-unit classes per semester

- ▶ Provides only 30 courses for graduation per student (120 units),
- ▶ Difficult to design a rich GE curriculum without affecting majors; curtailing GE would hurt students and departments that are significant GE providers.
- ▶ Does not facilitate transfer curriculum alignment well.
- ▶ One positive note: Would not worsen our current TT workload.

Alternate Model: Mix of 3 & 4 unit courses

- ▶ Some TT faculty may still face a 4-4 load, creating equity issues.
- ▶ Where pursued, 4 unit courses are predominantly upper division and graduate courses; 3 unit courses are predominantly lower division and G.E.
- ▶ Would have little impact on transfer students.
- ▶ Could encourage tenure stream faculty to abandon lower division teaching.
- ▶ Could set conditions for two or three-tiered faculty, among the TT and/or across TT and NTT faculty.
- ▶ Could create scheduling problems, since lecture halls and classrooms cannot be used as effectively with a mixed-class-length schedule.

Can CSUSB afford 3/3-unit
classes per term for all TT
faculty?

A matter of priorities...

Anticipated Revenue Increases by AY 2020-21:

Increased FTES should = \$6,811,059

The Cost of Hiring Additional Faculty

	TT FTEF	NON-TT FTEF	TOTAL FTEF
AY 2014 - 2015	382.1	261.4	643.5
ASSUMPTION: Tenure track density 60% AND SFR 25			
Faculty needed by 2020	403.0	268.7	671.7
Additional faculty needed	20.9	7.3	28.2
Cost of additional faculty hired 2014 to 2020	\$2,090,800	\$363,600	\$2,454,400
ASSUMPTION: Tenure track density 60% AND SFR 23.8			
Faculty needed by 2020	423.3	282.2	705.5
Additional faculty needed	41.2	20.8	62.0
Cost of additional faculty hired 2014 to 2020	\$4,122,773	\$1,040,924	\$5,163,697
ASSUMPTION: Tenure track density 63.6% AND SFR 23.8 (per Strategic Plan)			
Faculty needed by 2020	448.7	256.8	705.5
Additional faculty needed	66.6	-4.6	62.0
Cost of additional faculty hired 2014 to 2020	\$6,662,739	-\$229,059	\$6,433,681

The increase in revenue from FTES
PLUS money budgeted in the Strategic
Plan Implementation Proposal should
be sufficient to pay for the increased
expenses of course buyouts for Tenure
Track FTEF.

		Cost of 1 Course Buyout per TT FTEF	Annual Cost of New Faculty Hired by 2020	Annual Cost of Buyouts plus Cost of New Faculty
ASSUMPTION	TT FTEF			
60% TT Density and SFR 25	403.0	\$2,015,040	\$2,454,400	\$4,469,440
60% TT Density and SFR 23.8	423.3	\$2,116,639	\$5,163,697	\$7,280,336
63.6% TT Density and SFR 23.8	448.7	\$2,243,637	\$6,433,681	\$8,677,318
		Cost of 2 Course Buyouts per TT FTEF	Annual Cost of New Faculty Hired by 2020	Annual Cost of Buyouts plus Cost of New Faculty
ASSUMPTION	TT FTEF			
60% TT Density and SFR 25	403.0	\$4,030,080	\$2,454,400	\$6,484,480
60% TT Density and SFR 23.8	423.3	\$4,233,277	\$5,163,697	\$9,396,975
63.6% TT Density and SFR 23.8	448.7	\$4,487,274	\$6,433,681	\$10,920,955

Where there's a will, there's a way

Year	Total Baseline Minus Central	Year to Year Change	Amount to Academic Affairs	Year to Year Change	% to Acad. Affairs	Amount to Colleges and Museum	Year to Year Change	% to Colleges and Museum
2011-12	\$90,218,121	NA	\$61,247,848	NA	67.89%	\$48,995,754	NA	54.31%
2012-13	\$91,178,876	1.05%	\$61,734,822	0.79%	67.71%	\$49,342,976	0.70%	54.12%
2013-14	\$98,433,324	7.37%	\$64,849,535	4.80%	65.88%	\$48,724,705	-1.27%	49.50%
2014-15	\$102,687,387	4.14%	\$67,410,942	3.80%	65.65%	\$50,207,963	2.95%	48.89%
2015-16	\$103,962,868	1.23%	\$67,092,495	-0.47%	64.54%	\$51,988,618	3.43%	50.01%