

The page features a decorative graphic consisting of several overlapping circles in various shades of blue, arranged in a descending staircase pattern from the top right towards the bottom right. Two thin, light blue lines intersect at the top left and extend diagonally across the page, framing the text area.

## **Western Connecticut State University**

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

### Overview of the study

Workload issues at Western Connecticut State University can be considered in the context of the university's most recent strategic plan and vision statement, which were unveiled in spring 2007, after a multi-year planning process. These documents highlight Western's commitment to the following goals:

- Recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty who are committed to teaching and student success
- Capitalizing on the university's geographic location, including its proximity to New York City and opportunities that are available within the region
- Building a diverse academic community
- Providing high quality academic programs
- Offering a student-focused learning environment
- Delivering affordable educational opportunities (learning opportunities equivalent to the best private institutions, but at a public university price)

The goals contained in the university's strategic plan have direct implications for the workloads of academic professionals, including faculty, librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors. Some of these implications include:

- Maintaining small class sizes (consistent with recommendations of disciplinary and/or accrediting bodies) to promote a personalized learning environment for students
- Enhancing the first-year experience (FYE) to promote student engagement in academic work
- Emphasizing the importance of student-faculty collaboration in research projects and other academic endeavors
- Developing new international opportunities to prepare students to participate in a global society
- Assessing student learning outcomes and program quality within each academic department
- Supporting faculty in the development of their scholarship and in their ongoing work to offer a state-of-the-art curriculum

Discussions of academic work at Western also need to be placed into the context of the students whom the university serves. Between 2004 and 2010, total enrollment grew by 11.9% (from 5,884 to 6,582). Given expectations for further enrollment growth (4% per year, according to the FY11 Spending Plan), the university must find ways to expand academic programs and services without compromising quality. University leaders, therefore, should be prepared to address several growth-related issues, including:

- Identifying the desirable proportion of courses taught by full-time and part-time faculty within each academic program
- Providing more extensive support to part-time faculty to acknowledge the important role that they play in fostering student success

- Examining the level of support provided for students who need to develop their academic skills, and determining appropriate roles for faculty and advising center staff in addressing the needs of under-prepared students
- Determining how the university can maintain a personalized learning environment for students, as enrollments become larger

This report will examine a broad range of workload issues at Western, as well as characterize the academic work environments experienced by full-time and part-time faculty, librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors. Data sources for this report include:

#### Survey Data

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

#### Interview Data

- 7 interviews with full-time faculty members
- 5 interviews with part-time faculty members
- 5 interviews with academic department chairs
- 3 interviews with faculty search committee chairs
- 4 interviews with administrators
- 3 interviews with librarians
- 3 interviews with coaches/trainers
- 1 interview with a counselor

#### Institutional Data

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

#### **How will the data be used?**

Survey data will be used to examine workloads and collect information regarding perceptions of the work environment. In the faculty surveys, several items collected data that will be compared to national averages. In this way, we can compare faculty workloads and perceptions of the work environment to those of 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 will be used to examine how workloads are experienced by full-time and part-time CSU AAUP members. These data will help us identify the organizational structures, practices, and policies that shape and influence workloads. The interviews will also provide data regarding how CSU AAUP members perceive and experience the work environment at Western.

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

All data collection protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Western.

Next, we will present some technical information regarding certain aspects of the research design. In particular, we will explain:

- How the national comparisons will be made with the faculty survey data
- What the response rates were for the surveys administered in this study
- How the faculty load credit data were supplied by the CSU system office
- How the interview and focus group participants were selected

### Survey data: National comparative analyses

When available, faculty survey findings from Western will be compared to data from the **National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty** (NSOPF). The most recent version of NSOPF (2004) relies on the 2000 Carnegie Classification of Higher Education Institutions, in which Western is classified as a **public master's I** institution. Therefore, comparisons will be made to faculty data from that institutional sector.

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 workload and faculty perceptions of academic work life.

For more information about NSOPF, go to: <http://www.nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf/>

### Survey data: Response rates

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Full-time faculty survey 1 (spring 2009)</b><br><br>CSU AAUP provided a list that contained valid email addresses for 198 full-time faculty members. A total of 81 faculty responded, resulting in a response rate of 40.9%. | <b>Full-time faculty survey 2 (fall 2009)</b><br><br>CSU AAUP provided a list that contained valid email addresses for 218 full-time faculty members. A total of 64 faculty responded, resulting in a response rate of 29.4%. |
| <b>Part-time faculty survey 1 (spring 2009)</b><br><br>CSU AAUP provided a list that contained valid email addresses for 176 part-time faculty members. A total of 25 faculty responded, resulting in a response rate of 14.2%. | <b>Part-time faculty survey 2 (fall 2009)</b><br><br>CSU AAUP provided a list that contained valid email addresses for 301 part-time faculty members. A total of 39 faculty responded, resulting in a response rate of 13.0%. |

For the part-time faculty surveys, the response rates and the total number of respondents were low for all four CSU institutions. Therefore, part-time faculty survey data will be analyzed in a system-wide report, rather than institution-by-institution.

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.

During the spring 2010 semester, surveys were distributed to all full-time and part-time librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors working in the CSU system. At Western, a total of 8 librarians, 3 coaches/trainers, and 1 counselor completed their respective surveys. Given the small numbers of study participants, these survey data will be analyzed system-wide, rather than institution-by-institution.

### **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 awarded for instructional and non-instructional activities.

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

The study utilized two sources of recommendations for identifying potential study participants. Names of potential study participants were supplied by a faculty representative of CSU AAUP at Western, and by the academic deans and chief academic officer at Western. 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 study 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 workload; and 3) appropriate

representation of the disciplinary variation at Western, 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 officer (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.

### **Structure of this report**

This report will present the quantitative data first, in four sections.

1. **Faculty workload data.** This section will examine the number of hours worked per week, as reported by full-time faculty at Western, as well as faculty-reported summer activity. When available, comparisons will be made to national averages from NSOPF.
2. **Faculty load credit data.** This section will present an analysis of full-time and part-time faculty load credit data supplied by the CSU system office. Data were provided for four consecutive academic years: 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009.
3. **Instructional and scholarly practices.** This section will discuss survey findings regarding the types of instructional practices that full-time faculty use in the classroom at Western. In particular, this section focuses on the pedagogical practices that research indicates are most closely associated with promoting academic achievement. When available, comparisons will be made to national averages from NSOPF.
4. **Job satisfaction and the work environment.** This section will describe the survey data associated with full-time faculty perceptions of the work environment at Western, as well as their levels of satisfaction with various dimensions of their job. When available, comparisons will be made to national averages from NSOPF.

Then, the report will present the qualitative data in five sections.

1. **Teaching loads and teaching effectiveness.** This section will describe full-time faculty members' experiences with the 4-4 teaching load at Western, as well as the relationship between the teaching load and teaching practices. Faculty members indicated that the workload associated with a 4-4 teaching load interferes with their ability to engage in innovative pedagogical practices and hinders their ability to remain current within their academic disciplines and fields of study. Furthermore, faculty in the sciences explained how contemporary pedagogy in lab-based courses demands a substantial investment of faculty time, but the current practice of awarding partial load credits for lab-based courses does not accurately reflect this workload.
2. **Research expectations, promotion, and tenure.** This section will address the widespread perception among faculty members that research expectations are increasing at Western. Faculty discussed the implications of rising research expectations for the promotion and tenure process, and they described recent efforts to clarify the criteria for such reviews. Some faculty indicated that the 4-4 teaching load prevents them from conducting the type and amount of

research that is now expected for promotion and tenure. Other study participants argued that the university does not provide a sufficient amount of reassigned time for research.

3. **Administrative initiatives.** Study participants described a range of new initiatives that have emerged to advance the university's strategic plan. Western has strengthened its first-year experience (FYE) program and created new international learning opportunities for students. University administrators have also encouraged academic departments to engage in assessment and seek accreditation where appropriate. Faculty members, however, questioned whether the university provides sufficient administrative support for academic departments that are now expected to implement many more projects and initiatives. Department chairs expressed concerns about the effects of administrative initiatives on their workloads, and this section will devote attention to the work roles of department chairs at Western.
4. **Faculty recruitment, hiring, and professional development.** This section will examine how new full-time faculty members are recruited and hired at Western, from the perspective of faculty search committee chairs, as well as university administrators. We will also explore the types of professional development opportunities that are available for faculty once they arrive at Western.
5. **Librarians, coaches, trainers, counselors, and part-time faculty members.** Again, given the small sizes of these groups, the quantitative analysis of survey data will be offered in the system-wide report. In this report for Western, we will focus on the campus-specific issues that emerged from data provided in interviews.

The report concludes with a summary of the key findings and some initial recommendations for policy and practice. An appendix to the report contains selected, verbatim responses to open-ended survey items, from the spring 2009 and fall 2009 full-time and part-time faculty surveys. Data from the open-ended responses were selected to represent various themes and findings that were highlighted in this report.

## Quantitative Analysis: Section 1

### Faculty Workload Data

In the spring 2009 survey, full-time faculty members 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). When these hours were totaled, the average work week was 53.4 hours (see Finding 1.1).

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 hours were totaled, the average number of hours worked per week was 58.15 (see Finding 1.2), which is higher than the 53.4 hours per week reported by faculty for the previous item in this survey.

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 slightly higher number of hours worked.

#### Finding 1.1

Full-time faculty at Western reported working an average of 53.4 hours per week, which is nearly equivalent to the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions (53.2 hours per week).

|                  | Paid work for institution | Unpaid work for institution | External work, paid | External work, unpaid | Total |
|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Western          | 41.4                      | 5.6                         | 2.9                 | 3.5                   | 53.4  |
| National average | 44.4                      | 4.5                         | 2.2                 | 2.2                   | 53.2  |

#### Finding 1.2

Full-time faculty at Western allocated more hours per week to **undergraduate instruction** than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions.

|                           | Western |         | National average |         |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|
|                           | Hours   | Percent | Hours            | Percent |
| Undergraduate instruction | 35.47   | 61.0%   | 28.30            | 53.2%   |
| Graduate instruction      | 5.12    | 8.8%    | 6.28             | 11.8%   |
| Research                  | 7.99    | 13.7%   | 7.93             | 14.9%   |
| Other (including service) | 9.57    | 16.5%   | 10.69            | 20.1%   |
| Total                     | 58.15   | 100%    | 53.20            | 100%    |



In contrast, full-time faculty at Western allocated fewer hours per week to **graduate instruction** than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions. This finding reflects enrollment patterns at Western, where graduate students constitute approximately 10% of total enrollments.<sup>1</sup>

Full-time faculty at Western allocated 7.99 hours per week to **research and scholarship**, which was nearly equivalent to the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions (7.93 hours per week).

Conversely, full-time faculty at Western allocated fewer hours per week to **service and other activities** than the national average (9.57 hours compared to 10.69). This finding, however, should 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.

### **Finding 1.3**

Full-time faculty at Western are engaged in significant amounts of work during the summer months, most of which connects to their work roles at the university.

The academic work of full-time faculty at Western extends far beyond the nine-month contract. According to the fall 2009 survey, 33% of full-time faculty reported that they teach during the summer at Western.

Furthermore, many faculty members indicated that the 4-4 teaching load does not allow them to make sufficient progress on their research agendas during the academic year, so the summer becomes a time to engage in “catch up” work. According to the fall 2009 survey, full-time faculty spent an average of 100.2 hours over the summer, working on research and other scholarly activity – the equivalent of two-and-a-half 40-hour work weeks.

Full-time faculty at Western also reported spending an average of 32.4 hours during the summer preparing for classes for the next academic year.

In total, full-time faculty at Western reported that they spent 173.4 hours on academic work during summer 2009 (not including summer teaching). This is the equivalent of more than four 40-hour work weeks, during the months for which faculty are not “on contract.” National data for comparative purposes are not included in NSOPF.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2008 WCSU Enrollment Report indicated an undergraduate enrollment of 5,768 (89.3%) and a graduate enrollment of 693 (10.7%).

| <b>Summer Activity</b>  | <b>Average number of hours spent on activity during summer 2009</b> |
|---|---|
| Preparing for classes for the next academic year  | 32.4  |
| Research and other scholarly activity   | 100.2   |
| Supervising students in internships or field placements   | 4.1   |
| Administrative responsibilities (department chair, program coordinator)   | 9.9   |
| Advising students within your department or program (include work with student clubs)   | 4.1   |
| Thesis direction (includes master's and doctoral theses/dissertations)  | 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) | 8.7   |
| Unpaid (pro bono) service to academic professional associations and journals in my field or discipline  | 12.0  |
| <b>Total hours of academic work during summer 2009 (average)</b>  | <b>173.4</b>  |

## Quantitative Analysis: Section 2

### Faculty Load Credits

#### Finding 2.1

Full-time faculty members at Western received an average of 12.16 load credits per semester, and 81.3% of those load credits were awarded for activity that pertains directly to instruction.

Across the four academic years for which data were provided, full-time faculty at Western earned an average of 12.16 load credits per semester. Among these load credits, an average of 9.89 were for instruction (courses, labs, supervision of student teachers, independent studies, thesis supervision, and supplemental lab credits), while 2.27 were for non-instructional activities. Thus, 81.3% of load credits were awarded for faculty activity that pertains directly to instruction.

| 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> |

#### Load credits awarded to faculty at Western by semester

|   | Fall 2005 | Spring 2006 | Fall 2006 | Spring 2007 |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Total load credits per full-time faculty member             | 11.74     | 11.54       | 11.85     | 12.20       |
| Instructional load credits per full-time faculty member     | 9.42      | 9.33        | 9.62      | 9.83        |
| Non-instructional load credits per full-time faculty member | 2.32      | 2.21        | 2.23      | 2.37        |

|   | Fall 2007 | Spring 2008 | Fall 2008 | Spring 2009 | Overall average |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|
| Total load credits per full-time faculty member             | 13.01     | 12.27       | 12.22     | 12.39       | 12.16           |
| Instructional load credits per full-time faculty member     | 10.79     | 9.84        | 9.95      | 10.22       | 9.89            |
| Non-instructional load credits per full-time faculty member | 2.22      | 2.43        | 2.27      | 2.17        | 2.27            |

Across the four academic years of data, 72.4% of all load credits were awarded for teaching courses. The other instructional categories included labs/studios (3.0%), independent studies (2.0%), supervision of student-teachers (0.6%), supplemental lab (0.6%), and thesis supervision (0.2%).

Among the non-instructional categories, administrative duties accounted for 7.7% of all load credits awarded to faculty at Western, and reassigned time for curriculum development also accounted for 7.7% of the total load credits. Other non-instructional categories included reassigned time for research (2.1%), external grants (0.4%), other non-instructional (0.3%), and online course development (less than 0.1%).

Sabbaticals comprised 2.3% of all load credits.

| <b>Distribution of Load Credits Across Activities:<br/>Four-Year Totals (includes sabbaticals, leaves)</b> |                |             |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <b>Activity</b>  | <b>LC</b>      | <b>%</b>    |
| FT Sabbatical  | 462.0          | 2.3%        |
| FT Medical Leave   | 150.1          | 0.7%        |
| FT Unpaid Leave  | 0.0            | 0.0%        |
| FT Courses   | 14617.0        | 72.4%       |
| FT Lab   | 610.3          | 3.0%        |
| FT Student-Teach Supervise   | 124.8          | 0.6%        |
| FT Ind Study   | 404.6          | 2.0%        |
| FT Thesis  | 33.0           | 0.2%        |
| FT Special Assign  | 0.0            | 0.0%        |
| FT Admin Duties  | 1544.7         | 7.7%        |
| FT Reassign Curriculum   | 1545.7         | 7.7%        |
| FT Grants  | 83.0           | 0.4%        |
| FT Online  | 1.5            | 0.0%        |
| FT Supp Lab  | 121.5          | 0.6%        |
| FT Reassign Research   | 427.0          | 2.1%        |
| FT Other Non-Instructional   | 60.0           | 0.3%        |
|  | <b>20185.1</b> | <b>100%</b> |

When we control for sabbaticals and leaves, we find that 74.7% of all load credits were awarded for teaching courses. The other instructional categories included labs/studios (3.1%), independent studies (2.1%), supervision of student-teachers (0.6%), supplemental lab (0.6%), and thesis supervision (0.2%).

Among the non-instructional categories, controlling for sabbaticals and leaves, administrative duties accounted for 7.9% of all load credits awarded to faculty at Western, and reassigned time for curriculum development also accounted for 7.9% of the total load credits. Other non-instructional categories included reassigned time for research (2.2%), external grants (0.4%), other non-instructional (0.3%), and online course development (less than 0.1%).

| <b>Distribution of Load Credits Across Activities:<br/>Four-Year Totals</b> (controls for sabbaticals, leaves) |                |             |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| <b>Activity</b>  | <b>LC</b>      | <b>%</b>    |
| FT Courses   | 14617.0        | 74.7%       |
| FT Lab   | 610.3          | 3.1%        |
| FT Student-Teach Supervise   | 124.8          | 0.6%        |
| FT Ind Study   | 404.6          | 2.1%        |
| FT Thesis  | 33.0           | 0.2%        |
| FT Special Assign  | 0.0            | 0.0%        |
| FT Admin Duties  | 1544.7         | 7.9%        |
| FT Reassign Curriculum   | 1545.7         | 7.9%        |
| FT Grants  | 83.0           | 0.4%        |
| FT Online  | 1.5            | 0.0%        |
| FT Supp Lab  | 121.5          | 0.6%        |
| FT Reassign Research   | 427.0          | 2.2%        |
| FT Other Non-Instructional   | 60.0           | 0.3%        |
|  | <b>19573.1</b> | <b>100%</b> |

### **Finding 2.2**

Western consistently fulfilled the contractually obligated number of load credits regarding reassigned time for research; however, faculty reported that the current allocation of load credits for research is insufficient.

According to the collective bargaining agreement (August 2007 – August 2011), 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.

|                              |           |             |           |             | <b>Current Collective Bargaining Agreement</b> |             |           |             | <b>Overall average</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------------------|
|                              | Fall 2005 | Spring 2006 | Fall 2006 | Spring 2007 | Fall 2007                                      | Spring 2008 | Fall 2008 | Spring 2009 |                        |
| 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 research comprised 2.2% of the total load credits awarded to faculty at Western. The comparable percentages at the other CSU institutions were 4.2% at Central, 3.3% at Southern, and 1.4% at Eastern.

Several full-time faculty members at Western, who were interviewed for this study, indicated that the number of load credits awarded for research activity remains insufficient to address faculty goals and institutional expectations for research and creative activity.

### Finding 2.3

Western consistently fulfilled the contractually obligated number of load credits for reassigned time for curriculum development.

According to the collective bargaining agreement (August 2007 – August 2011), Western is obligated to provide 87 load credits per semester for reassigned time for curriculum development, faculty development, and instructional enhancement (article 10.6.5). 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 curriculum development comprised 7.9% of the total load credits awarded to faculty at Western. The comparable percentages at the other CSU institutions were 10.3% at Southern, 4.5% at Eastern, and 4.4% at Central.

### Finding 2.4

Among the CSU institutions, Western occupied a middle-range (along with Southern) in terms of sabbatical load credits per faculty member, per year.

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

Western awarded an average of 115.5 sabbatical load credits per year. The average full-time faculty headcount during those years was 207.5. Thus, Western awarded 0.557 sabbatical load credits per full-time faculty member, per year.

**Finding 2.5**

At Western, 38.7% of all load credits awarded for instruction were earned by part-time faculty members.

Across the eight semesters for which data were provided, part-time faculty accounted for 40.7% of all load credits awarded for teaching courses. No load credit activity was reported for part-time faculty in any of the other instructional categories.

The 2007-2011 collective bargaining agreement specifies that no more than 20% of instructional load credits should be attributable to part-time faculty. 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.

| <b>Grand Total All Terms</b> |                        |                        |                           |                                |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                              | <b>PT Load Credits</b> | <b>FT Load Credits</b> | <b>Total Load Credits</b> | <b>% of Load Credits by PT</b> |
| Courses                      | 10028.36               | 14616.95               | 24645.31                  | 40.7%                          |
| Lab                          | 0                      | 610.30                 | 610.30                    | 0.0%                           |
| Student-Teach Supervise      | 0                      | 124.83                 | 124.83                    | 0.0%                           |
| Ind study                    | 0                      | 404.62                 | 404.62                    | 0.0%                           |
| Thesis                       | 0                      | 33.00                  | 33.00                     | 0.0%                           |
| Supp Lab                     | 0                      | 121.48                 | 121.48                    | 0.0%                           |
| <b>Grand Total</b>           | <b>10028.4</b>         | <b>15911.2</b>         | <b>25939.5</b>            | <b>38.7%</b>                   |

**Finding 2.6**

Among the CSU institutions, Western occupied a middle-range (along with Central) in the amount of non-instructional load credits awarded to full-time faculty members.

Faculty at Western earned an average of 2.27 non-instructional load credits per semester.

Comparatively, faculty at Southern received 3.18, faculty at Central received 2.10, and faculty at Eastern received 1.70.

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

**Finding 2.7**

The academic departments that carried the highest **total number of load credits** per semester included chemistry (13.87), world languages and literature (13.17), writing, linguistics, and creative process (12.95), biology (12.77), and health promotion and exercise science (12.73).

Two of these departments (chemistry and biology) have large numbers of lab-based courses. The number of load credits for these departments would have been even higher, if the university had allocated 1.0 load credit for each hour of class time (rather than 0.75). Therefore, this finding has important implications for the current method of assigning load credits for laboratory courses.

**Department Load Credits per Full-time Faculty, Adjusted for Sabbaticals and Leaves**

| <b>Department</b>                         | <b>Total Load Credits/FT FTE</b> |                |                |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|   | <b>Mean</b>                      | <b>Minimum</b> | <b>Maximum</b> |
| Accounting                                | 11.76                            | 10.52          | 12.52          |
| Art                                       | 11.81                            | 9.82           | 13.64          |
| Biology                                   | 12.77                            | 10.75          | 17.13          |
| Chemistry                                 | 13.87                            | 9.78           | 17.35          |
| Communication                             | 11.50                            | 9.45           | 12.68          |
| Computer Science                          | 12.60                            | 11.39          | 14.08          |
| Div. of Justice & Law Administration      | 12.01                            | 10.72          | 12.42          |
| Education & Educ. Psychology              | 12.06                            | 11.06          | 13.56          |
| English                                   | 11.88                            | 10.71          | 12.84          |
| Finance                                   | 11.93                            | 11.25          | 12.06          |
| Health Promotion & Exercise Science       | 12.73                            | 11.93          | 13.98          |
| History & Non-Western Cultures            | 12.01                            | 10.43          | 13.09          |
| Management                                | 12.45                            | 11.56          | 13.48          |
| Management Information Systems            | 12.08                            | 10.20          | 15.00          |
| Marketing                                 | 12.40                            | 10.08          | 13.50          |
| Mathematics                               | 12.04                            | 10.58          | 13.08          |
| Music & Music Education                   | 12.08                            | 8.72           | 13.31          |
| Nursing                                   | 12.08                            | 9.71           | 13.39          |
| Philosophy & Humanistic Studies           | 11.13                            | 10.00          | 12.11          |
| Physics, Astronomy, Meteorology           | 12.63                            | 11.49          | 14.27          |
| Psychology                                | 11.72                            | 10.99          | 13.49          |
| Social Sciences                           | 12.15                            | 10.81          | 13.01          |
| Social Work                               | 11.95                            | 10.73          | 12.65          |
| Theatre Arts                              | 11.91                            | 11.25          | 13.00          |
| World Languages & Literature              | 13.17                            | 11.75          | 15.50          |
| Writing, Linguistics, Creative Process    | 12.95                            | 11.90          | 13.63          |
| <b>University Total (all departments)</b> | <b>12.16</b>                     | <b>8.72</b>    | <b>17.35</b>   |



**Finding 2.8**

The academic departments that carried the highest number of **instructional load credits** per semester were chemistry (11.88), music and music education (11.19), biology (10.88), health promotion and exercise science (10.70), and nursing (10.62).

Three of these departments (chemistry, biology, and nursing) have large numbers of lab-based courses, for which faculty receive 0.75 load credits for each hour of class time (e.g., 2.25 load credits for teaching a 3-hour lab). The number of instructional load credits for these departments would have been even higher, if the university had allocated 1.0 load credit for each hour of class time. Therefore, this finding has important implications for the current method of assigning load credits for laboratory courses.

**Department Instructional Load Credits per Full-time Faculty, Adjusted for Sabbaticals and Leaves**

| Department                                | Instructional Load Credits/FT FTE |             |              |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|   | Mean                              | Minimum     | Maximum      |
| Accounting                                | 9.86                              | 8.52        | 10.56        |
| Art                                       | 9.78                              | 8.41        | 11.64        |
| Biology                                   | 10.88                             | 8.40        | 15.66        |
| Chemistry                                 | 11.88                             | 7.79        | 15.79        |
| Communication                             | 9.79                              | 6.45        | 11.68        |
| Computer Science                          | 10.24                             | 9.14        | 11.83        |
| Div. of Justice & Law Administration      | 10.43                             | 9.37        | 10.87        |
| Education & Educ. Psychology              | 9.10                              | 8.56        | 10.10        |
| English                                   | 9.27                              | 7.25        | 11.44        |
| Finance                                   | 10.35                             | 9.60        | 10.80        |
| Health Promotion & Exercise Science       | 10.70                             | 9.79        | 11.73        |
| History & Non-Western Cultures            | 10.19                             | 9.23        | 11.41        |
| Management                                | 8.96                              | 7.63        | 9.73         |
| Management Information Systems            | 8.54                              | 6.00        | 10.50        |
| Marketing                                 | 9.02                              | 7.08        | 10.08        |
| Mathematics                               | 9.73                              | 8.15        | 10.84        |
| Music & Music Education                   | 11.19                             | 7.81        | 12.40        |
| Nursing                                   | 10.62                             | 8.10        | 12.08        |
| Philosophy & Humanistic Studies           | 9.05                              | 7.50        | 10.11        |
| Physics, Astronomy, Meteorology           | 9.40                              | 7.89        | 10.97        |
| Psychology                                | 10.11                             | 8.64        | 11.24        |
| Social Sciences                           | 9.72                              | 8.71        | 11.10        |
| Social Work                               | 8.62                              | 7.69        | 10.13        |
| Theatre Arts                              | 8.13                              | 7.50        | 9.25         |
| World Languages & Literature              | 10.00                             | 8.61        | 11.00        |
| Writing, Linguistics, Creative Process    | 8.37                              | 7.60        | 9.53         |
| <b>University Total (all departments)</b> | <b>9.89</b>                       | <b>6.00</b> | <b>15.79</b> |

**Finding 2.9**

In order to award one load credit for each laboratory/studio hour taught, Western would need to allocate 20.4 additional load credits per year (beyond those already designated as supplemental lab credits).

Western awarded 610 load credits to full-time faculty for teaching labs during the eight semesters for which data were supplied by the CSU system. As noted in the collective bargaining agreement, faculty receive 0.75 load credits for teaching one hour of a laboratory course (e.g., 2.25 load credits for teaching a 3-hour lab).

If faculty had received one load credit for each hour of laboratory courses that they taught, then Western would have awarded a total of 813 load credits during the eight semesters for which data were supplied by the CSU system.

The difference between these scenarios amounts to 203 load credits over eight semesters (610 vs. 813), which amounts to 25.4 load credits per semester, or **50.8 load credits per year**.

The collective bargaining agreement calls for supplemental lab credits to be awarded, in order to address this gap. Western is obligated to award 10.75 load credits per semester for supplemental lab credit (article 10.6.4), 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.

|                         | 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 | 14.0                                    | 22.6        | 16.0      | 13.1        | 14.1      | 17.1        | 9.8       | 14.8        | 15.2                         |

Across the eight semesters of data, Western awarded an average of 15.2 supplemental lab credits per semester, or **30.4 load credits per year**.

Thus, the “cost” of awarding one load credit for each laboratory hour taught by full-time faculty would be an additional 20.4 load credits per year, bringing the total to 50.8.

Current annual supplemental lab allocation 30.4 + 20.4 = 50.8 (the annual gap between the two scenarios described above)

## Quantitative Analysis: Section 3

### Instructional and scholarly practices

#### Pedagogical practices in undergraduate courses

NSOPF collects national data regarding faculty teaching practices in undergraduate courses. We collected comparative data from full-time faculty at Western who teach undergraduate courses.

Full-time faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were **more likely** than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions to use the following teaching practices:

- Multiple-choice exams
- Short-answer exams
- Student presentations
- Peer feedback on student work

Full-time faculty members at Western were **less likely** than the national average to use the following teaching practices:

- Essay exams
- Research papers and writing assignments

Faculty at Western reported using several teaching practices at rates that were comparable to (within 5% of) national averages for:

- Assessing multiple drafts of students’ written work
- Group and team projects
- Lab, shop, or studio assignments
- Service-learning or co-op experiences

In some instances, faculty at Western were using pedagogical practices (student presentations, peer feedback) that research has shown to be effective in promoting student learning. On the other hand, faculty at Western were less likely than the national average to require research papers and writing assignments in their courses, and they were more likely than the national average to use multiple-choice exams.

The limited use of research papers and the reliance on multiple-choice exams may be related to heavy teaching loads that limit the ability of faculty to engage in more time-consuming pedagogical practices. Another potential explanation for these findings may pertain to the faculty development offerings at Western: specifically, the level of support and assistance the university provides faculty members who seek to integrate innovative teaching practices into their courses.

University leaders at Western should attempt to identify and remove disincentives that may dissuade faculty members from using pedagogical practices that promote student engagement and learning, as well as create new support mechanisms for faculty who want to try new pedagogical approaches.

**Finding 3.1**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were more likely to use multiple-choice exams in their courses than the national average for faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

| <b>Multiple-choice exams</b> |             |              |          |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|
|                              | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western                      | 31.7%       | 38.3%        | 30.0%    |
| National average             | 32.1%       | 26.4%        | 41.5%    |

**Finding 3.2**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were less likely to use essay exams in their courses than the national average for faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

| <b>Essay exams</b> |             |              |          |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|
|                    | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western            | 25.4%       | 30.5%        | 44.1%    |
| National average   | 31.9%       | 30.8%        | 37.3%    |

**Finding 3.3**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were more likely to use short-answer exams in their courses than the national average for faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

| <b>Short-answer exams</b> |             |              |          |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|
|                           | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western                   | 31.7%       | 40.0%        | 28.3%    |
| National average          | 33.4%       | 31.9%        | 34.8%    |

**Finding 3.4**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were less likely to use term/research papers and writing assignments in their courses than the national average for faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

| <b>Term/research papers and writing assignments</b> |             |              |          |
|---|-------------|--------------|----------|
|   | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western   | 45.9%       | 31.1%        | 23.0%    |
| National average                                    | 49.2%       | 33.1%        | 17.7%    |

**Finding 3.5**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western assessed multiple drafts of students' written work at rates comparable to (with 5% of) the national average for faculty in "public master's I" institutions.

| <b>Multiple drafts of written work</b> |             |              |          |
|--|-------------|--------------|----------|
|  | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western                                | 22.4%       | 20.7%        | 56.9%    |
| National average                       | 21.0%       | 26.5%        | 52.5%    |

**Finding 3.6**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were more likely to have students deliver presentations in their courses than the national average for faculty in "public master's I" institutions.

| <b>Oral presentations</b> |             |              |          |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|
|                           | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western                   | 30.0%       | 53.3%        | 16.7%    |
| National average          | 33.5%       | 34.4%        | 32.1%    |

**Finding 3.7**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western had students work on group and team projects at rates comparable to (within 5% of) the national average for faculty in "public master's I" institutions.

| <b>Group and team projects</b> |             |              |          |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|
|                                | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western                        | 26.2%       | 32.8%        | 41.0%    |
| National average               | 28.1%       | 31.2%        | 40.6%    |

**Finding 3.8**

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were more likely than the national average to have students evaluate and provide feedback on each other's work.

| <b>Student evaluations of each other's work</b> |             |              |          |
|---|-------------|--------------|----------|
|   | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western   | 16.9%       | 35.6%        | 47.5%    |
| National average                                | 18.7%       | 22.0%        | 59.2%    |

### Finding 3.9

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western used laboratory, shop, or studio assignments in their courses at rates comparable to (within 5% of) the national average for faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

| Laboratory, shop, or studio assignments |             |              |          |
|---|-------------|--------------|----------|
|   | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western                                 | 20.3%       | 28.8%        | 50.8%    |
| National average                        | 23.8%       | 22.5%        | 53.7%    |

### Finding 3.10

Faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western incorporated service-learning or co-op experiences into their courses at rates comparable to (within 5% of) the national average for faculty in “public master’s I” institutions.

| Service-learning or co-op experiences requiring interactions with the community or business/industry |             |              |          |
|--|-------------|--------------|----------|
|  | All Classes | Some classes | Not used |
| Western  | 6.9%        | 22.4%        | 70.7%    |
| National average   | 10.5%       | 19.4%        | 70.1%    |

## Innovation in Teaching

In addition to examining teaching practices in undergraduate courses, we 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 Western 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 indicate that large majorities of full-time faculty at Western are actively engaged in experimenting with new teaching methods (84.1%), changing their teaching practices to get students more involved in their own learning (77.8%), and incorporating new instructional technologies into their courses (74.6%).

The majority of full-time faculty at Western are also:

- Substantially revising their syllabi to reflect significant changes in their discipline or field of study (62.9%)
- Revising their syllabi to devote more attention to building students’ academic skills (58.7%)
- Revising their syllabi and course requirements to fulfill expectations from professional accreditation associations (58.1%)
- Selecting readings and discussion topics to include more perspectives on cultural/ethnic diversity (54.8%)

**Finding 3.11**

Over the previous two years, 58.7% of faculty members at Western 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                               | 33.3% |
|  | Did this for some of my courses                              | 25.4% |
|  | Not necessary or relevant to my courses                      | 38.1% |
|  | Did not do this, lack of time                                | 3.2%  |
|  | Did not do this, lack of support or professional development | 0.0%  |

**Finding 3.12**

Over the previous two years, 77.8% of faculty members at Western 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                               | 39.7% |
|   | Did this for some of my courses                              | 38.1% |
|   | Not necessary or relevant to my courses                      | 20.6% |
|   | Did not do this, lack of time                                | 1.6%  |
|   | Did not do this, lack of support or professional development | 0.0%  |

**Finding 3.13**

Over the previous two years, 54.8% of faculty members at Western 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                               | 25.8% |
|  | Did this for some of my courses                              | 29.0% |
|  | Not necessary or relevant to my courses                      | 43.5% |
|  | Did not do this, lack of time                                | 1.6%  |
|  | Did not do this, lack of support or professional development | 0.0%  |

**Finding 3.14**

Over the previous two years, 84.1% of faculty members at Western have experimented with new teaching approaches.

|   |  |       |
|---|--|-------|
| Experimented with new teaching approaches | Did this for all of my courses                               | 38.1% |
|   | Did this for some of my courses                              | 46.0% |
|   | Not necessary or relevant to my courses                      | 11.1% |
|   | Did not do this, lack of time                                | 3.2%  |
|   | Did not do this, lack of support or professional development | 1.6%  |

**Finding 3.15**

Over the previous two years, 62.9% of faculty members at Western 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                               | 25.8% |
|  | Did this for some of my courses                              | 37.1% |
|  | Not necessary or relevant to my courses                      | 32.3% |
|  | Did not do this, lack of time                                | 3.2%  |
|  | Did not do this, lack of support or professional development | 1.6%  |

**Finding 3.16**

Over the previous two years, 74.6% of faculty members at Western 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                               | 44.4% |
|   | Did this for some of my courses                              | 30.2% |
|   | Not necessary or relevant to my courses                      | 17.5% |
|   | Did not do this, lack of time                                | 6.3%  |
|   | Did not do this, lack of support or professional development | 1.6%  |

**Finding 3.17**

Over the previous two years, 58.1% of faculty members at Western 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                               | 32.3% |
|  | Did this for some of my courses                              | 25.8% |
|  | Not necessary or relevant to my courses                      | 33.9% |
|  | Did not do this, lack of time                                | 4.8%  |
|  | Did not do this, lack of support or professional development | 3.2%  |

**Scholarly activities**

The spring 2009 faculty survey also asked full-time faculty members at Western to describe the extent of their involvement in a range of scholarly activities. Study findings indicated that:

- 77.8% of full-time faculty at Western reported involvement in scholarly work that spans multiple disciplines
- 68.3% of full-time faculty at Western reported that they participate in teaching enhancement workshops
- 66.7% of full-time faculty at Western reported involvement in mentoring new faculty.



Slightly more than half of the full-time faculty (55.6%) reported that they conduct at least some research on college teaching and learning, while one-third of full-time faculty (33.3%) reported some level of involvement in team-teaching courses with other faculty.

|  | <b>Great Extent</b> | <b>Some Extent</b> | <b>Not at All</b> |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Conduct research on college teaching and learning (scholarship of teaching and learning) | 15.9%               | 39.7%              | 44.4%             |
| Participate in teaching enhancement workshops  | 12.7%               | 55.6%              | 31.7%             |
| Engage in academic work that spans multiple disciplines                                  | 34.9%               | 42.9%              | 22.2%             |
| Mentor new faculty   | 15.9%               | 50.8%              | 33.3%             |
| Team-teach courses with other faculty  | 12.7%               | 20.6%              | 66.7%             |
| Collaborate with other scholars on a research team                                       | 11.1%               | 49.2%              | 39.7%             |
| Collaborate with the local community in research   | 4.8%                | 24.2%              | 71.0%             |
| Collaborate with the local community in teaching (e.g., service learning projects)       | 9.7%                | 21.0%              | 69.4%             |

## **Quantitative Analysis: Section 4**

### **Job Satisfaction and the Academic Work Environment**

This section of the report contains four parts, which focus on: 1) faculty job satisfaction, 2) time and work schedule pressures, 3) institutional support for faculty work, and 4) organizational climate.

#### **Section 4.1**

##### **Faculty job satisfaction**

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

Full-time faculty members at Western were less satisfied than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions with the following dimensions:

- Institutional support for instructional technology
- Institutional support for teaching improvement
- Workload

Full-time faculty members at Western were also less likely than the national average to believe that:

- Good teaching is rewarded by the institution
- Women faculty are treated fairly at this institution

Full-time faculty members at Western reported satisfaction levels that were comparable to (within 5% of) national averages for:

- Faculty autonomy regarding decisions about course content and teaching methods
- Quality of equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction
- Overall job satisfaction

Full-time faculty at Western reported comparable levels of agreement with (within 5% of) the national average regarding whether faculty members from racial and ethnic minority groups are treated fairly at the institution.

Full-time faculty members at Western reported satisfaction levels that were higher than the national average for the following dimensions:

- Salary
- Benefits available in faculty compensation packages

And full-time faculty at Western reported higher levels of agreement than the national average regarding whether part-time faculty are treated fairly at this institution.

Note: satisfaction level includes both “very satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied” 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 | Western          | 76.2%          | 22.2%              | 1.6%                  | 0.0%              |
|  | National average | 77.8%          | 17.9%              | 3.6%                  | 0.7%              |

|   |                  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities (teaching with technology) | Western          | 27.4%          | 48.4%              | 19.4%                 | 4.8%              |
|   | National average | 43.0%          | 42.4%              | 11.3%                 | 3.3%              |

|   |                  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| The quality of equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction | Western          | 41.3%          | 30.2%              | 22.2%                 | 6.3%              |
|   | National average | 28.8%          | 43.6%              | 19.9%                 | 7.7%              |

|   |                  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Institutional support for teaching improvement (including grants, release time, and professional development funds) | Western          | 9.5%           | 41.3%              | 30.2%                 | 19.0%             |
|   | National average | 23.9%          | 40.8%              | 25.1%                 | 10.2%             |

|               |                  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Your workload | Western          | 22.2%          | 34.9%              | 19.0%                 | 23.8%             |
|               | National average | 24.0%          | 40.8%              | 24.8%                 | 10.4%             |

|             |                  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Your salary | Western          | 28.6%          | 38.1%              | 12.7%                 | 20.6%             |
|             | National average | 13.9%          | 39.5%              | 28.0%                 | 18.5%             |

|                               |                  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| The benefits available to you | Western          | 49.2%          | 41.3%              | 4.8%                  | 4.8%              |
|                               | National average | 29.5%          | 45.3%              | 18.3%                 | 6.9%              |

|                                       |                  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Your job at this institution, overall | Western          | 49.2%          | 39.7%              | 9.5%                  | 1.6%              |
|                                       | National average | 36.2%          | 48.4%              | 12.3%                 | 3.0%              |

|   |                  | Agree Strongly | Agree Somewhat | Disagree Somewhat | Disagree Strongly |
|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Faculty at this institution are rewarded for good teaching. | Western          | 6.5%           | 33.9%          | 38.7%             | 21.0%             |
|   | National average | 25.1%          | 50.6%          | 16.6%             | 7.7%              |

|   |                  | Agree Strongly | Agree Somewhat | Disagree Somewhat | Disagree Strongly |
|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Women faculty members are treated fairly at this institution. | Western          | 27.0%          | 50.8%          | 14.3%             | 7.9%              |
|   | National average | 50.9%          | 35.5%          | 10.4%             | 3.2%              |

|   |                  | Agree Strongly | Agree Somewhat | Disagree Somewhat | Disagree Strongly |
|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups are treated fairly at this institution. | Western          | 37.1%          | 46.8%          | 8.1%              | 8.1%              |
|   | National average | 50.9%          | 36.9%          | 9.3%              | 2.9%              |

|   |                  | Agree Strongly | Agree Somewhat | Disagree Somewhat | Disagree Strongly |
|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Part-time faculty are treated fairly at this institution. | Western          | 21.0%          | 45.2%          | 22.6%             | 11.3%             |
|   | National average | 19.1%          | 40.3%          | 26.3%             | 14.3%             |

## Section 4.2

### Time and work schedule pressures

The spring 2009 faculty survey included four items that measured the extent of time pressure experienced by faculty members. Full-time faculty at Western reported high levels of dissatisfaction with:

- Time available for research and creative activity (61.9% somewhat or very dissatisfied)
- Time available for keeping current in their field or discipline (52.4% somewhat or very dissatisfied)

On the other hand, a majority of survey respondents reported some level of satisfaction with:

- Time available for advising students (71.4% somewhat or very satisfied)
- Time available for class preparation (68.3% somewhat or very satisfied)

|   | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied |
|---|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor        | 31.7%          | 39.7%              | 22.2%                 | 6.3%              |
| Time available for class preparation                                  | 30.2%          | 38.1%              | 22.2%                 | 9.5%              |
| Time available for research, creative, and other scholarly activities | 9.5%           | 28.6%              | 33.3%                 | 28.6%             |
| Time available for keeping current in your field                      | 11.1%          | 36.5%              | 23.8%                 | 28.6%             |

## Section 4.3

### Institutional support for faculty work

The spring 2009 faculty survey included nine items that measured faculty satisfaction with different dimensions of institutional support for faculty work. The majority of full-time faculty survey respondents at Western were somewhat or very satisfied with:

- Office space and equipment (80.7% somewhat or very satisfied)
- Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities (75.8% somewhat or very satisfied; although this was less than the national average)
- Quality of equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction (71.5% somewhat or very satisfied)
- Institutional support to experiment with new teaching approaches (58.0% somewhat or very satisfied)

- Quality of equipment and facilities available for research (53.3% somewhat or very satisfied)
- Institutional support for teaching improvement (50.8% somewhat or very satisfied; although this was less than the national average)
- Institutional support for research, creative, and other scholarly activities (50.8% somewhat or very satisfied)
- Institutional support for faculty to engage in public/community outreach (50.8% somewhat or very satisfied)

The majority of survey respondents (51.6%) were very or somewhat dissatisfied with support services (secretarial and/or professional staff).

This section of the survey also asked faculty to report on their level of satisfaction with the availability of child care. More than 85% indicated that the availability of child care is not applicable to them. However, among the faculty for whom child care is applicable, 77.8% were somewhat or very satisfied.

|  | <b>Very satisfied</b> | <b>Somewhat satisfied</b> | <b>Somewhat dissatisfied</b> | <b>Very dissatisfied</b> |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Institutional support to experiment with new teaching approaches   | 17.7%                 | 40.3%                     | 29.0%                        | 12.9%                    |
| Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities (teaching with technology) *                              | 27.4%                 | 48.4%                     | 19.4%                        | 4.8%                     |
| The quality of equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction *  | 41.3%                 | 30.2%                     | 22.2%                        | 6.3%                     |
| The quality of equipment and facilities available for research (including labs, libraries, and research technology)                        | 21.0%                 | 32.3%                     | 32.3%                        | 14.5%                    |
| Institutional support for teaching improvement (including grants, release time, and professional development funds) *                      | 9.5%                  | 41.3%                     | 30.2%                        | 19.0%                    |
| Institutional support for research, creative, and other scholarly activities (including grants, release time, and research administration) | 7.9%                  | 42.9%                     | 33.3%                        | 15.9%                    |
| Institutional support for faculty to engage in public/community outreach   | 7.9%                  | 42.9%                     | 39.7%                        | 9.5%                     |
| Office space and equipment   | 33.9%                 | 46.8%                     | 12.9%                        | 6.5%                     |
| Support services (secretarial and/or professional staff support)   | 17.7%                 | 30.6%                     | 22.6%                        | 29.0%                    |

\* These data were also reported earlier in this report as comparisons to national averages from NSOPF data.

|  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Very dissatisfied | Not applicable |
|--|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Availability of child care at this institution | 7.9%           | 3.2%               | 1.6%                  | 1.6%              | 85.7%          |

#### Section 4.4 Organizational climate

The spring 2009 full-time faculty survey included 17 items that measured different dimensions of organizational climate. At Western, high levels of agreement were reported for:

- Faculty having a voice in what occurs within their departments (85.7% agreed strongly or somewhat)
- Faculty feeling that they are part of an institutional community (79.3% agreed strongly or somewhat)
- Faculty reporting that diverse values and beliefs are respected at this institution (77.8% agreed strongly or somewhat)
- Faculty being able to talk openly with their faculty colleagues at this institution (76.2% agreed strongly or somewhat)

Conversely, the highest levels of disagreement were registered for:

- Faculty at this institution are rewarded for serving the public/community (77.4% disagreed strongly or somewhat)
- Faculty at this institution are rewarded for good teaching (59.7% disagreed strongly or somewhat)

|  | Agree Strongly | Agree Somewhat | Disagree Somewhat | Disagree Strongly |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| It is easy to talk openly with faculty in this institution.                      | 34.9%          | 41.3%          | 15.9%             | 7.9%              |
| It is easy to talk openly with administrators at this institution.               | 25.4%          | 42.9%          | 14.3%             | 17.5%             |
| Diverse values and beliefs are respected at this institution.                    | 27.0%          | 50.8%          | 15.9%             | 6.3%              |
| Administrators at this institution consider faculty concerns when making policy. | 15.9%          | 52.4%          | 17.5%             | 14.3%             |
| Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making.                     | 17.5%          | 41.3%          | 31.7%             | 9.5%              |
| I have a voice in what goes on at this institution.                              | 11.1%          | 42.9%          | 38.1%             | 7.9%              |



|  | <b>Agree Strongly</b> | <b>Agree Somewhat</b> | <b>Disagree Somewhat</b> | <b>Disagree Strongly</b> |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| My department does a good job of mentoring new faculty.  | 23.8%                 | 34.9%                 | 22.2%                    | 19.0%                    |
| I have a voice in what goes on in my department.   | 47.6%                 | 38.1%                 | 6.3%                     | 7.9%                     |
| This institution provides sufficient support for faculty development.  | 9.5%                  | 44.4%                 | 28.6%                    | 17.5%                    |
| This institution's faculty evaluation and reward system is a good fit with my scholarly research and teaching interests. | 12.7%                 | 46.0%                 | 20.6%                    | 20.6%                    |
| The work environment at this institution fosters a balance between work and personal life.                               | 19.0%                 | 44.4%                 | 22.2%                    | 14.3%                    |
| Faculty at this institution are rewarded for good teaching. *  | 6.5%                  | 33.9%                 | 38.7%                    | 21.0%                    |
| Faculty at this institution are rewarded for being good researchers.   | 16.1%                 | 35.5%                 | 29.0%                    | 19.4%                    |
| Faculty at this institution are rewarded for serving the public/community.   | 3.2%                  | 19.4%                 | 53.2%                    | 24.2%                    |
| The criteria for tenure and promotion at this institution are clear.   | 28.6%                 | 41.3%                 | 17.5%                    | 12.7%                    |
| I feel that I am a part of the institutional community.  | 33.3%                 | 46.0%                 | 12.7%                    | 7.9%                     |
| I plan to stay at this university as long as possible.   | 40.3%                 | 41.9%                 | 12.9%                    | 4.8%                     |

\* These data were also reported earlier in this report as comparisons to national averages from NSOPF data.

## Qualitative Analysis: Section 1

### Teaching Loads and Teaching Effectiveness

Faculty at Western argued that the 4-4 teaching load interferes with their ability to incorporate innovative pedagogical practices into their courses, and may shortchange their efforts to promote student learning, especially for students who need additional assistance in building basic academic skills. Study participants also discussed the need to link class sizes to normative practices recommended by the various professional associations of academic disciplines. Finally, faculty stated that the load credit system does not accurately account for several types of instructional activity, including labs, independent studies, undergraduate research projects, and field and clinical supervision.

#### Instructional workload

Faculty indicated that Western's 4-4 teaching load does not allow them to remain current within their academic fields and disciplines; therefore, they expressed concerns regarding whether they can deliver an innovative, cutting-edge curriculum to students. A faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, noted that "I keep getting further behind reading the professional literature because of my teaching load. I can't maintain my professional stature, which is related to my teaching load." Similarly, a faculty member in a scientific discipline argued that faculty in her field need to be engaged in research within the discipline so that their teaching remains relevant and of high quality.

In our department, we want faculty who are actively engaged in peer-reviewed professional activities in the discipline so that they are able to teach our students the processes and culture of science. But the faculty workload model currently in place does not reflect the kinds of changes that we think should be happening in our department.

A department chair in arts and sciences argued that the current teaching load hinders the development of faculty as scholars and teachers. This chair suggested that changing to a 3-3 teaching load would enable faculty to remain current within their academic disciplines and provide faculty with greater opportunities to engage in innovative teaching practices. "In terms of faculty development, the first priority should be changing the teaching load. At least make the load be 3-3."

Other study participants noted that accreditation associations do not believe that a 4-4 teaching load is compatible with providing a high-quality, university-level education. A faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, discussed 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."

Several faculty members indicated that their desire is not to work less, but to reallocate their current workloads in different ways. As a faculty member in arts and sciences explained:

Workload is not the issue. Teaching load is the issue. Faculty need to be working differently, not less. And they 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.

Furthermore, study participants noted that the 4-4 teaching load puts additional strain on junior faculty members who are not only preparing to teach many courses for the first time, but also are attempting to build research agendas that establish their impact in their respective fields and disciplines. A junior faculty member in arts and sciences indicated that the teaching load, coupled with the university's research expectations, interferes significantly with work-life balance: "I don't have a family, and I can't fathom how junior faculty who do have children manage to do both their job and stay involved with their family."

Some departments have taken steps to help junior faculty members obtain greater balance between teaching and research. A department chair in a professional field, for example, indicated that some departments enable junior faculty to teach multiple sections of the same course, so that time for class preparation is reduced. "In our department, we try to give the junior faculty two of the same classes so that their preparation time is reduced." Other study participants, however, noted that this practice was not possible in their departments due to small size (not enough enrollment to warrant multiple sections) or degree of specialization (multiple sections of a highly specialized course are not necessary).

### **Academic skills of students**

Study participants explained that the 4-4 teaching load becomes even more daunting when one considers the academic skills of the students who enroll at Western. Faculty members explained that Western is attracting high quality students, yet their academic skills remain below what is required to succeed in college. As a department chair in arts and sciences explained, "Even the best students nowadays do not have the greatest skills with regard to writing and communication. They might have good SATs, but their writing skills aren't great."

A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences noted that students' writing skills are likely linked to their reading comprehension abilities. "As the years go by, I am finding that students are having a harder time performing well because they don't read well."

A department chair in arts and sciences attributed academic skill gaps to the amount of time that students spend working at jobs for pay. This chair asked: "How do you encourage young people to believe the life of the mind is something worth fighting for, when students are working 30 to 40 hours a week and trying to go [to college] full-time?"

**Faculty members stated that the teaching load at Western hinders their ability to offer a relevant, cutting-edge curriculum.**

Some faculty with extensive experience at Western argued that the current teaching load is an artifact of the university's history as a normal school, and that the 4-4 load is now incompatible with providing a high-quality, university-level education.

A faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, stated that "the teaching load is a remnant of our origins as a normal school, and then a teachers college. In the 1970s, WestConn was reorganized into schools, and then the pressure mounted to hire faculty with doctoral degrees and research agendas."

Faculty who teach writing-intensive courses expressed strong concerns regarding workloads and effective teaching practices. A faculty member in arts and sciences noted that "faculty who teach writing courses spend a great deal of time grading papers. It is a major workload issue. Let's say a faculty member is teaching three writing courses, and you're making students write like you should, meaning a paper every ten days or so, then that would amount to more than 60 papers to grade every two weeks."

A faculty member in a professional program indicated that graduate students also need writing support, but the university's writing center is not open when they are on campus.

I spend a lot of time working with students on basic writing skills... The graduate students who take classes in the evenings have no access to the writing lab, which is only open during the day. The university support isn't there for graduate students.

Study participants indicated that they are willing to help underprepared students build their academic skills, but they acknowledged that such work increases their workloads substantially. Put simply, underprepared students have needs, faculty are willing to assist, but the 4-4 teaching load stretches the faculty resource to the point where quality assistance cannot always be offered. An administrator summarized this critical dilemma for the university:

One of the major factors that affects faculty workload is that our students have more needs and expect more services than they used to. We want to do extraordinary things for our students, but that desire is combined with the extraordinary needs that our students have. And that makes [faculty work] challenging. Sometimes I feel like a social worker responding to student problems... So the main problem at the university is that we have extraordinary ambition teamed with extraordinary need.

### **Class size**

Study participants also noted that class size needs to be considered in any examination of teaching loads. Several faculty and administrators referred to Western's strategic plan, which aims to align class sizes with enrollment levels recommended by the professional societies of various academic disciplines. Some faculty described efforts to reduce class sizes in their departments, while others expressed apprehension that their class sizes would soon be raised.

Study participants strongly endorsed the current class size caps that are included in the collective bargaining agreement; they noted that these class size limits help ensure that students receive the personalized learning environment that Western's vision statement promises. Yet several study participants noted that budget concerns may jeopardize the university's ability to offer this type of learning environment for its students. An administrator, for example, acknowledged budget pressures regarding class size, but also described efforts to bring class sizes into alignment with the recommendations of the academic disciplines:

We are growing, maybe more than the other CSU institutions. While class size hasn't changed, we will have to see what the budget brings. Our largest class is 38 students...In some disciplines, we are going the other way and decreasing class size, since the strategic plan has decided that class size should be the size that the professional associations determine to be appropriate.

A faculty member in arts and sciences confirmed that the university was reducing class sizes in his department. "Our strategic plan says that class enrollments should be set according to what the professional organizations recommend. So now, we are actually reducing our class size [from 30 students] to 20 students over the next few years. Our professional organization recommends [a class size of] 15, so I guess that gets us somewhat closer."

In other departments, however, faculty were pessimistic regarding class size policies. A faculty member in the sciences, for example, indicated that her department was being pressured to increase class sizes, while at the same time, faculty were seeking to reduce class sizes in order to use more innovative pedagogical practices in the teaching of science. “There is pressure on increasing class size at the same time that faculty want to move toward more intensive activities to teach the process of science.”

### **Faculty load credit system**

Faculty in the sciences argued that not only is the teaching load heavy, but the system designed to account for faculty workloads discounts their efforts to promote student learning. They indicated that lab-based instruction is perhaps the most critical component of teaching and learning in the sciences, yet the university’s load credit system does not appropriately acknowledge the workload associated with teaching lab-based courses. As a faculty member in the sciences explained:

Labs are time intensive and critical to science education. But they are not accounted for adequately in the teaching workload. Also, 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.

Currently, faculty receive 0.75 load credits for each hour of lab instruction, in contrast to the 1.0 load credit per instructional hour in other courses. Faculty in the sciences argued that the partial load credit does not account for the amount of time that it takes to organize and teach a lab-based course. The major workload issues regarding lab-based courses, according to study participants, include preparing the lab, taking down the lab, and grading the lab reports. A faculty member in the sciences, for example, described her workload in teaching a lab-based course: “Prepping the labs is very time consuming. And the students do lab reports every week, which takes a lot of time to grade. In my lab, the students do 10 experiments each semester with reports for each.”

Another faculty member in the sciences reported a similar concern regarding the workload for lab-based courses: “The way they assign load credits for labs is a travesty. It takes 3 or 4 hours to prep a lab, and then the lab runs for 3 hours, and then it takes another 3 to 4 hours to clean it up. With all that work, it is insulting that we don’t get full credit for it.”

Study participants in the sciences and in professional fields also argued that faculty do not receive enough load credit for supervising undergraduate research projects or students’ clinical or field-based work. A faculty member in the sciences, for example, explained that independent studies and undergraduate research projects are critical for preparing future scientists, and the supervision of these projects entails a great deal of faculty effort.

The load credit system does not adequately account for the time spent supervising students doing research. For example, senior research students are supposed to spend 12 hours per week in lab. We get a fraction of that in load credit; I think we get 1.5 credits per 4 credits that the student gets. Usually for undergraduates, you know, you have to spend a lot of time with them. When they first start out, they can’t really be unsupervised in the lab. So that could be 8 or 12 hours that you have to spend in the lab getting them trained, making sure they understand how the process works before they can work somewhat independently.

In conclusion, the main issues regarding teaching load were:

- 1. Faculty indicated that the 4-4 teaching load may hinder their ability to remain current in their fields and disciplines, and may limit their ability to engage in innovative teaching practices.** This qualitative finding should be considered in the context of the quantitative survey findings, which showed that faculty at Western were less likely than the national average to assign research papers and more likely to use multiple-choice tests (see page 19). The teaching load at Western may, in fact, limit the use of innovative teaching practices. As one possible response, Western could designate a specific amount of reassigned time to be allocated to faculty who are engaged in innovative pedagogical practices. Faculty could receive reassigned time to participate in workshops or seminars on a specific innovative teaching practice that they want to implement in their courses. Faculty learning groups, supported with reassigned time, could also be organized around specific teaching and learning initiatives, such as service-learning or strategies for improving student writing. These groups could share information and resources, and promote the use of innovative pedagogies across the university. Furthermore, the university could establish a standard policy for granting course load reductions to new, junior faculty members so that they can develop their courses and try new teaching approaches.
- 2. Faculty reported that the 4-4 teaching load interferes with their ability to provide students with a personalized learning experience.** The strategic plan at Western indicates that class sizes should be set on the basis of recommendations offered by each discipline's academic society. This practice, if followed in each field, could enable faculty to devote more individualized attention to students, and to develop learning environments that contribute to higher levels of student learning. In addition to class size considerations, the university also needs to consider the number of courses that faculty teach, in relation to the expectations of accreditation associations. University leaders will need to assess the resource implications of pursuing accreditation for various academic programs, and acknowledge that reassigned time will be necessary in those fields in order to grant faculty the requisite teaching loads.
- 3. Faculty argued that the load credit system does not accurately account for the workloads associated with lab-based 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 university provides only partial load credit for teaching such courses. A potential response, here, would be to 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 scientific and technical workforce, the university should take steps to remove any disincentives that may dissuade faculty in the sciences from using effective pedagogical practices.
- 4. Faculty indicated that working with academically underprepared students increases their workloads.** The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) at Western could convene open dialogues on teaching academically underprepared students, and enable faculty to share effective practices with their colleagues. The university could also assess the academic support services currently available for students, and determine the level and extent of support that students need. Then, faculty, staff, and administrators can work together to identify appropriate roles for faculty and staff in supporting academic skills development in the student population.

## Qualitative Analysis: Section 2

### Research expectations, promotion, and tenure

#### Rising research expectations

Faculty members indicated that expectations for research productivity have increased in recent years, due in part to Western's ongoing evolution as a university. Study participants reported that Western now has a more ambitious mission and desire to be more visible within the region and nationally. Some study participants believe that this pursuit for prestige and reputation has led to the expectation that faculty will publish more research in highly-visible venues.

These rising research expectations, however, conflict with the university's maintenance of a 4-4 teaching load. A department chair in arts and sciences, 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." Similarly, a faculty member in arts and sciences stated that "expectations for research have increased, but the teaching load has remained the same."

The changing expectations for research manifest themselves in the promotion and tenure process, where review committees are now expecting to see greater productivity in peer-reviewed journals. A department chair in a professional field, for example, noted that "in P&T [promotion and tenure], there have been changes. Within the last 5 or 6 years, more publications are needed."

These increasing productivity expectations are causing some junior faculty members to question the priorities of the university, and to reassess whether Western is where they want to establish themselves as scholars. As a junior faculty member in arts and sciences 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.

The interaction between rising research expectations and the 4-4 teaching load created stress and anxiety for some junior faculty members.

Similarly, faculty who were seeking promotion to the rank of full professor indicated that the "bar has been raised" with respect to research output. A faculty member in arts and sciences reported that "the research and scholarship expectations are much higher, especially for a teaching school, with our teaching load. It is especially high for promotion from associate professor to full professor. There are a lot of rejections and people are going away very disappointed and devastated." Likewise, a department chair in arts and sciences noted that "people are well aware of the publication records of those who gain promotion [to full professor] and those who don't. It's not hard to figure out." Several faculty indicated that they had structured their careers around the teaching-university model, only to discover that when they sought promotion, the criteria resembled the research-university model.

An administrator, however, argued that research expectations at Western are manageable, appropriate, and in keeping with the teaching mission of the institution: "For P&T, teaching well is a must. But faculty

are also expected to remain active in their fields. But our research expectations are adjusted to the teaching load.”

### **Availability of reassigned time for research**

The provision of reassigned time does enable the university to adjust teaching loads in order to help faculty advance their research agendas. Several faculty members, however, indicated that the process for obtaining reassigned time for research is highly competitive. A junior faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, described how her application for reassigned time was rejected: “Right now, I am not able to do any research. I applied for research reassigned time, but didn’t get it. I will try to make some progress [on research] this summer, but I don’t know if that will be enough [for promotion and tenure].” An administrator, however, offered a contrary perspective and noted that “a high percentage of those who apply get reassigned time [for research].”

Several faculty members in small departments felt compelled not to apply for reassigned time, so that their programs could offer the full range of courses that their students need to graduate. A department chair in arts and sciences, for example, explained that “there is research reassigned time, but a lot of us feel that we can’t take it, because our department is so small. We wouldn’t be able to offer the classes that our majors need, and we would probably lose majors as a result.” Another department chair in arts and sciences expressed a similar concern: “Everyone is a team player in the department, and they know that if they take three credits off [for reassigned time], who is going to teach their classes?”

Other study participants argued that a one-semester allocation of reassigned time may be insufficient for carrying out more extensive research studies. A junior faculty member in the sciences, for example, stated 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.”

### **Impact on promotion and tenure**

To reiterate, faculty perceived that research expectations are rising, while teaching loads remain consistently high. This perception, in turn, generated a great deal of concern and anxiety regarding promotion and tenure reviews.

Study participants indicated that the university has made efforts to clarify performance expectations for faculty. Each academic department has created a set of guidelines regarding the quality of teaching, service, and research needed for promotion and tenure. A faculty member in arts and sciences described the guidelines that were developed in his department: “Our department has very clear criteria about P&T. We have developed statements that go on for several pages describing expectations. The expectations for scholarly activity are particularly clearly laid out.” Likewise, an administrator noted that “the departmental guidelines are clear about how much publication and presenting junior faculty are expected to do, and every year we review their portfolios for renewal and we let them know what they need to work on.”

Some junior faculty were pleased with the communication and guidance that they were receiving on issues of promotion and tenure. A recently-tenured faculty member in arts and sciences described the P&T process as “very transparent. The AAUP does a fantastic job of making the process and the priorities clear for junior faculty.” In contrast, other study participants expressed concerns regarding whether they were producing sufficient amounts and appropriate types of research. These concerns



were most prevalent among faculty in the sciences. A tenured faculty member in the sciences, for example, explained that the time horizon for publishing research in the sciences is longer than in most other disciplines, and these timeframes are extended further because Western's teaching load does not permit faculty to spend concentrated periods of time working on their own research.

I think it is really hard, from a faculty workload perspective, to be a young faculty member, to try to really develop some good pedagogical methods in your classroom and also be asked to do some research that is publishable. And there are some challenges that are specific to faculty doing research in the sciences. Because we don't have consistent, concentrated blocks of time that we can be in the lab, it may take us 5 or 6 years to complete research and publish the results.

Another faculty member in the sciences indicated that faculty in the sciences at Western often incorporate students into their own research projects. This arrangement not only advances the faculty member's research agenda, but also provides the student with a personalized learning environment that fosters their professional growth and development as scientists. Yet, this faculty member argued that these practices may be misunderstood and penalized by the university's P&T committee.

Perhaps it is particularly true in the sciences that we have students working on research projects that we've developed. They can take a long time to get results, and I'm not sure if all disciplines understand how it works in the sciences. I don't know, maybe there is a miscommunication between the humanities and the sciences. So, I guess that I would want to make sure that there is someone on the P&T committee who represents the sciences.

Similarly, another faculty member in the sciences argued that the university P&T committee may not consider fully the unique context of and constraints on faculty research in the sciences.

One of my concerns is the extent that sciences are represented on the promotion and tenure committee. There were several years when no one from the sciences sat on the committee. During that time, no one in the sciences was promoted. And I think that is linked to a lack of understanding on the part of the committee, rather than a lack of merit on the part of the candidates. They [faculty from outside the sciences] don't really understand the needs, the pressures, and the problems that we run into in the sciences.

An administrator acknowledged this challenge, but noted that "it is really up to the candidate to make the vagaries of their discipline understandable, and explain how it might affect expectations on the P&T committee, which can be tough."

Some study participants expressed a further concern that the university's P&T committee relies on a narrow conceptualization of what constitutes research. This conceptualization of research, they argued, emphasizes peer reviewed publications but neglects other forms of scholarship, including those that pertain to community engagement. As one administrator stated, "P&T seems to go by the old fashioned standards of books and articles published and is less tolerant of other forms of scholarship. Professional fields like nursing, social work, and education sometimes have a hard time getting their work with schools or social service agencies recognized as scholarship."

In conclusion, the main issues regarding research expectations, promotion, and tenure were:

- 1. The interaction between rising research expectations and the 4-4 teaching load has created stress and anxiety for junior faculty and for faculty seeking promotion.** Academic departments at Western have attempted to alleviate these concerns by producing discipline-specific guidelines that articulate research expectations for promotion and tenure, yet many study participants expressed the concern that they could not keep pace with the university's research expectations while maintaining a 4-4 teaching load. In response to these concerns, Western could examine its practices regarding the allocation of reassigned time for research. First, Western could create a number of multi-year awards of reassigned time for research. Faculty could receive, for example, a 3-3 teaching load over two or three consecutive years to accommodate more expansive lines of research inquiry (rather than simply rely only on single-semester allocations of reassigned time). Second, Western could establish a standard policy for providing reduced teaching loads to new, junior faculty. This practice would not only help junior faculty build their research agendas, but also assist in their pedagogical development for teaching (see recommendation on page 38). Third, Western should address concerns of faculty in small departments regarding their reticence to apply for reassigned time. These faculty suggested that their departments would not be able to find qualified faculty to replace their absence in courses needed by their students. Is this perception related to a shortage of faculty in their respective departments, or do they lack appropriate part-time faculty who could teach courses for faculty who receive reassigned time? If the former, then the university should establish a faculty hiring plan to replenish faculty lines in departments that have been affected by hiring freezes and early retirement incentives. If the latter, then the university should assist with aggressive outreach in attempting to identify appropriately-qualified part-time instructors.
- 2. Despite the creation of P&T guidelines in each academic department, faculty in the sciences and faculty in professional fields expressed concerns that their research would not be evaluated appropriately by university committees.** Faculty in the sciences expressed the concern that university P&T committees do not understand the time horizons necessary to complete research within the sciences. Faculty in the professions argued that university P&T committees prioritize peer-reviewed publications and give little consideration to other forms of scholarship, such as community engagement. In order to establish greater confidence in the P&T process, faculty and administrators at Western could develop a university-wide statement that endorses multiple forms of scholarship. Western could also establish stronger communication between departmental evaluation committees (DECs) and the university's P&T committee. Forums for open discussion among DEC chairs, P&T committee members, and university administrators could help all parties understand and interpret the broad range of scholarly contributions made by faculty at Western.

## **Qualitative Analysis: Section 3**

### **Administrative initiatives**

Study participants described Western as a university with growing ambitions to provide distinctive academic programs and a personalized learning environment for students. These ambitions are reflected in the university's 2007 strategic plan and have manifested themselves in a range of new initiatives, including an emphasis on assessment and accreditation of academic programs. Faculty members indicated that they were generally supportive of these efforts, yet they expressed concerns regarding workload implications. Department chairs, in particular, argued that their workloads had increased substantially in recent years. Furthermore, faculty indicated that the 4-4 teaching load and their efforts to attain higher research standards preclude any opportunity for them to contribute more extensively in service to the university.

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

Faculty members generally agreed that the strategic planning process has been useful in setting a clear direction for the future of the institution. A department chair in arts and sciences, for example, explained that the strategic plan has not only catalyzed a range of new academic initiatives, but has also shifted the culture of the university.

The president did start a strategic planning process that has been very helpful. The vision for Western is that it becomes a private-level institution at a public school price, that has small classes and personalized instruction. The president and the provost are doing a good job in changing the culture of inferiority [at Western] and upgrading that feeling among faculty and staff.

Study participants were also supportive of the academic initiatives that have emanated from the strategic plan, but they expressed concerns regarding the workload implications of these initiatives. As a department chair in arts and sciences noted, "All these initiatives from the administration, like internationalization, advising, assessment, and accreditation, are all good, but we need more time to do them." Similarly, another department chair in arts and sciences described the workload that has been generated by the university's new ambitions:

The amount of work for the chair that comes from the administration has increased dramatically. It's not that anyone is being thoughtless about it, but the ambitions of the institution have grown. So when you divide out the responsibilities, a lot inevitably falls into the laps of the chairs.

Accreditation, assessment, internationalization, and the first-year experience program were noted by study participants as initiatives that have affected the workloads of faculty and department chairs.

Regarding accreditation for teacher education, department chairs in arts and sciences noted that they were compelled to participate in the NCATE process (since many of their majors are also seeking teacher certification), but these responsibilities were simply appended to their already extensive chair responsibilities. As one chair explained, "Every single year, more and more projects get handed down to us. For example, we just underwent the first accreditation process with NCATE... A lot was required of

chairs [for the NCATE review]. And this was added on to our regular responsibilities with no additional compensation.”

Study participants noted a similar issue regarding assessment. A department chair in arts and sciences 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.” Study participants acknowledged that assessment can be carried out as an extension of routine teaching practices, but the management and organization of the assessment process for a department requires an extensive amount of time. Thus, for chairs and some faculty, assessment represents an expansion of their work roles. As a chair in arts and sciences explained, “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.”

Study participants endorsed the university’s new emphasis on internationalization, as a way for Western to extend and enhance its educational opportunities for students and prepare them for participation in a global society. Yet, faculty members indicated that developing international partnerships requires an extensive amount of time, and they argued that the university does not provide sufficient incentives for faculty to make that investment of effort. As a faculty member in arts and sciences noted:

The internationalization of the campus has been huge, but seeking international partnerships requires a lot of work... We are getting 3 load credits for [taking students abroad for a course], so we might as well just teach a 100 level course and stay right here in Connecticut. There isn’t an understanding [among administration] of the amount of time and work that it takes to set up an international program.

The first-year experience program is part of the university’s approach to improving student retention rates. Chairs were generally supportive of allowing faculty in their departments to teach in the program, but they explained that when faculty teach in the FYE program, the department sometimes struggles to find faculty to teach courses within the major. A department chair in arts and sciences, for example, noted that:

Retention has been a concern, and that is where the first-year experience [program] came from... We need more faculty members who are committed to teaching the first-

**Faculty members acknowledged the benefits of Western’s strategic plan and wanted to contribute to new academic initiatives, but they indicated that their efforts were constrained structurally by a 4-4 teaching load and rising research expectations.**

As a department chair in arts and sciences explained, “The amount of new work – assessment, accreditation, emphasis on advising, annual reports tied to the strategic plan – it’s just too much.”

year experience classes, but by doing that, these faculty would be giving up teaching classes in their majors, because we don't have enough faculty.

Faculty and chairs explained that the workload implications of new initiatives are complicated by the lack of a mid-level administrative structure to support the work at the department level. Staffing levels in administrative offices have not been able to keep pace with growth in enrollments and aspirations at Western. A recent hiring freeze has complicated matters further. For example, an administrator noted that "we lost our grants officer and haven't been able to hire due to the freeze." Similarly, a department chair in arts and sciences noted that the university lacks an infrastructure to support community engagement and outreach: "We do a lot of community partnerships with local schools, but there isn't any infrastructure [at Western] to do this kind of work in an organized way." This study participant noted that other universities have offices of community engagement that support teaching and research in the local community, but Western lacks such a structure.

Similarly, a faculty member in education identified the need for additional administrative support for their ongoing assessment efforts, which are necessary to maintain NCATE accreditation. This study participant explained that it was unlikely that the university would hire an assessment coordinator, and that the administration would attempt to allocate load credits to a faculty member in order to perform those tasks: "The goal is to have a specific person working with [assessment]. Right now, we are without one, but hopefully next year, we will get someone on the faculty with an assessment background who can serve as faculty coordinator. And they would receive load credits, but I'm not sure how much."

### **Department chair workloads**

New academic initiatives at Western have had a significant effect on the workloads described by academic department chairs. A department chair in a professional field, for instance, explained that the workloads for chairs have expanded dramatically at Western, and the load credit allocations are not sufficient to alleviate the workload pressures: "I get 9 load credits for being chair. This might have been okay 10 years ago, but not now... There are just more students, more programs, more faculty, and more accreditation demands on a chair than there used to be."

In addition to implementing university initiatives at the department level, chairs explained that they receive frequent requests from the administration for data and reports. Some of these requests are made on short notice, according to study participants. For example, a chair in arts and sciences noted that:

We are asked to write a lot of reports. Some reports are predictable, scheduled on the academic planning calendar. But others are requested on short notice. Once, the dean asked me at 4:00 on a Thursday afternoon, when Friday was a three-day holiday, if I would write a report on [a recent state initiative in the discipline] and it was due on Monday. And I didn't have anything [prepared] about this [state initiative], so I spent all three of those days in my office writing the report. But nothing came of it. No new resources. Nothing. I feel that we do a lot of things as chair that don't come to anything.

Another arts and sciences chair described an effort by the administration to decentralize the budget process for hiring part-time faculty. This effort increased the workload of chairs, and they resisted. As a chair in arts and sciences explained, "One year, the administration asked departments to manage their

own adjunct faculty budgets. When our department was close to exhausting our funds for adjuncts, the administration said that I should contact other departments and see if they had any spare funds to share. That was ridiculous. Other chairs felt the same way, and we got vocal about the issue with the administration, and we refused to do it anymore.”

Other chairs described data requests from the administration, which they characterized as unreasonable or unfeasible. A chair in arts and sciences, for example, explained how the administration asked his department to collect data regarding why students leave the major.

Sometimes the administration asks us for things that aren’t possible to track. They asked us to track how many students begin as majors and how many of them graduate, and if they leave [the major], why they leave. Now, we keep very organized files on all current majors, but it just isn’t feasible for us to keep up with students who change their mind about the major and go somewhere else.

Several department chairs noted that dealing with under-enrolled courses and approving overrides to enrollment caps consumes a great deal of their time each semester. These two issues – under-enrolled courses and enrollment cap overrides – are interconnected. As one chair explained, “A week before classes start, the university cancels any course with fewer than 12 students, but then when students actually get around to registering, the courses are cancelled and then they have to get overrides to get in. It’s just a revolving door of work for chairs.”

Another department chair in arts and sciences explained that “we give overrides, and a lot of negotiation goes on to keep the under-enrolled classes alive by giving overrides in others.” Likewise, a department chair in arts and sciences argued that “there needs to be a change to the foolish method of cancelling under-enrolled classes the week before the semester begins. They need to change the student culture of how they enroll. Currently, there are a lot of students who don’t register for classes until the first week of class, and by that time, all of the under-enrolled classes are cancelled.”

Furthermore, some chairs indicated that their workloads have been extended by the need to manage a growing pool of part-time faculty in their departments. Enrollment growth, coupled with restricted hiring of full-time faculty, has resulted in the hiring of many more part-time faculty at Western, according to study participants. A department chair in a professional field, for example, noted that:

**Department chairs indicated that administrative initiatives, data requests, and inefficient bureaucratic procedures made their workloads unsustainable.**

A department chair in arts and sciences, for example, explained that “I will be stepping down, because I just can’t take it anymore. Too much work, not enough sleep. Last minute projects that cause me to cancel personal plans... I have been in the building after midnight three times this week. These things [last minute requests] happen all the time, and it isn’t because I’m sitting here spinning my wheels. I work at least 65 hours a week and most of it is chair related.”

Another chair in arts and sciences also lamented the workload: “I could never have done this [serve as chair] if I had children and that should never be a requirement for anyone. That’s sad.”

Our department is being pushed to grow, which means that we have to hire part-time faculty to handle the enrollment. Now, these faculty come out of the clinical setting and don't have much teaching experience, so I need to spend a lot of time mentoring them... I have to bring on so many part-time faculty each semester that it feels like I am running an employment agency.

Department chairs explained that they try to manage the workload by delegating responsibilities to their colleagues, but this approach has its limits. A department chair in arts and sciences noted that he allocates 3 of his 9 load credits to a colleague who shares some of the chair duties, yet he hesitates to burden the faculty in his department with more demands on their time.

The chair needs to delegate responsibilities among his colleagues. But our faculty are already overloaded with teaching and other responsibilities. They won't cut back on their duties to their students, so when are they going to find the time to do more? So I really hesitate to ask them to take on additional tasks. And I think a lot of other chairs don't pass on the work either.

Another chair in arts and sciences indicated that most chairs are carrying an overload, but the only way for chairs to "cash in" the overload credits for a reduced teaching load would be for them to leave the chair role: "I get 9 load credits as chair and I am required to teach 3 load credits. But if I have an overload, when am I ever going to be able to give that back? So it is a very exasperating situation."

### **The relationship between faculty and administration**

The long-term success of any strategic initiative in higher education is tied to the level and extent of collaboration between faculty and administration. And despite the workload challenges associated with new initiatives at Western, study participants described generally productive and collaborative relationships between faculty and administration. A faculty member in arts and sciences explained that the relationship between faculty and administration was "the best in years. The energy is good, and they're generally competent and generally don't get in your way." Similarly, a librarian noted significant improvements in recent years regarding the level of respect and trust between faculty and administration.

We have a new provost and a relatively new president, and there is a huge difference in the climate. When the president first arrived, the faculty were at war with the administration and everyone was miserable and unproductive. Now, we are fine, because we have a good provost, a good president. It is remarkable how much is dependent on who is in major administrative positions.

A few study participants, however, identified issues in which they believed that the administration did not communicate or consult sufficiently with the faculty. A chair in arts and sciences, for example, described a recent change by the administration regarding how the load credit policy is applied to independent studies:

If a faculty member leads an independent study for nine students, then that used to count as three load credits, one-third of a load credit for each student. But somehow

that has edged up to 12 students [to count as three load credits]. That's been an administrative fiat, not a faculty decision.

In conclusion, the main issues regarding administrative initiatives were:

1. **New emphases in accreditation, assessment, internationalization, and first-year experience programs have expanded the workloads of faculty and chairs.** Study participants noted that the administrative infrastructure to support new initiatives is severely limited. Staffing levels in administrative offices have not been able to keep pace with growth in enrollments and aspirations at Western. University leaders need to consider the resource implications of the strategic plan at Western, and identify the levels of faculty and staff support that are necessary to carry out new initiatives. Initially, the university may need to provide more reassigned time for faculty and chairs to engage in related strategic initiatives. For the longer term, the university should develop a faculty and staff hiring plan, which would link future position allocations to specific initiatives in the strategic plan. A hiring plan for administrative staff, for example, may need to include positions to support assessment and accreditation work in the academic departments. A faculty hiring plan, moreover, would need to account for faculty who elect to teach in the university's first-year program. Western could prioritize hiring more full-time faculty members, in part, to ensure that first-year seminars are taught by full-time faculty, while also maintaining sufficient numbers of faculty to teach courses within the major.
2. **Department chairs indicated that their work roles have become increasingly complex and time consuming.** Chairs noted that their workloads have expanded significantly due to administrative initiatives, data reporting requirements, inefficient bureaucratic procedures, and the need to hire and prepare more part-time faculty. In order to support department chairs, Western should develop a more streamlined system for collecting and retrieving data related to assessment and academic program performance. Such a system would reduce the likelihood that chairs will receive multiple requests for the same data, or requests for data that should be readily available in centralized offices. Inefficient bureaucratic procedures should also be simplified. For example, study participants noted that students must obtain the chair's approval for an enrollment cap override; chairs instead recommended that the university allow students to obtain such approvals directly from the faculty member teaching the course. Moreover, on the issue of under-enrolled courses, the university should establish an earlier deadline for student registration (and perhaps a late fee for students who do not comply), so that students are encouraged to register for courses well in advance of administrative decisions to cancel low-enrollment courses. Such efforts would also decrease the number of enrollment cap overrides that students would typically seek after under-enrolled sections of the course had been cancelled. Finally, department chairs who are actively engaged in mentoring part-time faculty should receive additional support and acknowledgment. Western's Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT), for example, could work with chairs in developing appropriate strategies for preparing part-time faculty for the classroom.



## Qualitative Analysis: Section 4

### Faculty recruitment, hiring, and professional development

#### Faculty recruitment and hiring

Search committee chairs indicated that administrative coordination needs to be improved in order to foster an effective recruitment and hiring process. Study participants described procedural changes that were made without consulting them. These changes unnecessarily increased their workloads. For example, a search chair described the implementation of a new, electronic system for submitting application materials:

The affirmative action office sometimes makes decisions without telling us. So they suddenly decided that all applications would go to that office first, electronically. Then, when the application deadline would arrive, the search chair would get all the applications electronically. But the system couldn't handle the large amount of data, and so we [search chairs] received just the cover letters without the resumes. It was a complete mess.

Similarly, another search chair in arts and sciences described an administrative directive for chairs to provide more information and personal guidance to candidates who were interviewing for faculty positions. Ultimately, the search chairs objected, and the practice was disbanded.

The administration started telling search chairs that they needed to take the candidates around the local community and show them possible schools for their children, and the search chairs were also asked to consult with the local chamber of commerce in order to gather information about housing, and transportation, and so on. This is the kind of stuff that [search] chairs simply don't have time to do... I recognize that this probably came from a conference that one of the affirmative action, equal opportunity staff attended, giving them ideas about helping candidates feel connected to the community. So I understand that, but the administration didn't think through what all of this means.... When our dean was told of this, she said, "This is simply not possible. There's just no way that my faculty should be asked to do this."

Search chairs across the university raised concerns about the lack of clerical support for conducting faculty searches. As one search chair explained, "There is no clerical support for the search. The chair does it all."

Faculty in the School of Business raised a broader concern regarding the salary levels offered to prospective faculty. They attributed several failed searches to the lack of competitive salaries: "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 search committee chairs emphasized the importance of fit in selecting faculty who will be successful at Western. Search chairs explained how they and their committee members carefully explain to candidates the workload and expectations at Western. As a search chair in arts and sciences noted:

Anyone who would decide to come to Western would need to be happy teaching a 4-4 load and under-prepared students. But we explain that to applicants in advance. Two of our recent hires are good researchers, but they decided to come here because they want to work with under-prepared students, which is great... Our students need a lot of interaction and support, and since the candidates do a sample teaching of a class, we get to see how they build a rapport with the students.

Finally, study participants also described searches that were cancelled due to a hiring freeze (actually, searches that were converted from tenure-track lines to emergency, one-year hires). The inability to hire new, full-time faculty constrains the ability of academic departments to meet the needs of students and accommodate the university's plans for growth. As a department chair in arts and sciences noted, "we have been asked to increase the number of courses offered to accommodate the rising numbers 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 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."

### **Faculty professional development**

Most study participants indicated that the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) provides a broad range of faculty development offerings, which are relevant to the pedagogical approaches that faculty are seeking to implement in their courses. A few study participants, particularly junior faculty members, noted that the university offers a large number of workshops on instructional technology, but relatively fewer offerings on teaching improvement. As a junior faculty member in arts and sciences reported, "There are a lot of workshops on Blackboard [course management software] and technology, but I haven't seen any for how to become a good teacher."

Junior faculty 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. A junior faculty member in the sciences, for example, explained that he attended a pedagogical workshop, but was unable to allocate additional time to deepening his understanding of related teaching practices: "I attended a workshop on process oriented inquiry, and I used it twice, but I don't have time to look into other activities that are part of this pedagogy."

Junior faculty indicated that the university provides a cross-departmental mentoring program, which provides new faculty with a source of support outside their departments and potentially offers a venue in which junior faculty can discuss problematic departmental dynamics without the possibility of negative repercussions or retribution. Yet, study participants noted a preference for more mentoring within their departments. A junior faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, explained that "I was assigned a mentor from another department, but I meet with her rarely, since there is hardly any time to meet, and also, it is more useful to meet faculty in the department who are in my field and know the issues."

Furthermore, regarding professional development, study participants expressed different views on the level and quality of support for instructional technology. Administrators and some faculty praised the university's efforts to incorporate technology into teaching, while other faculty reported limitations on support due to understaffing. A department chair in a professional field noted that "there is an excellent tech center for faculty training in Blackboard [course management software]." Likewise, an administrator noted that "the university has a very good support system for Blackboard and promotes it everywhere. Even the part-time faculty are well aware of it." In contrast, a department chair in arts and sciences argued that "the university computing center is very understaffed and needs to be available more to help faculty." And a faculty member in a professional field noted that "there is a lack of IT support due to understaffing. And there are few resources available for classes taught in the evenings."

In conclusion, the main issues regarding faculty recruitment, hiring, and professional development were:

1. **Study participants suggested the need for greater administrative coordination of faculty search procedures.** The increasingly competitive academic job market requires Western to develop quick, efficient processes for recruiting and attracting 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 could develop a procedures manual to guide faculty searches and specify the steps necessary at each stage of the search process.
2. **University leaders need to examine claims that salary offers are not competitive in certain fields and disciplines.** Survey data from spring 2009 indicated that the level of faculty satisfaction with salary at Western was higher than the national average for "public master's I" institutions (see pages 26). Nevertheless, Western offers 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.
3. **Enrollment growth, hiring freezes, and early retirements have created full-time faculty shortages in some academic departments.** Programs that are experiencing or planning for growth may not have the necessary faculty resources to address student enrollments. As Western emerges from current financial constraints and is able to hire new full-time faculty, the university will need to consider decisions regarding the allocation of faculty lines in relation to the institution's long term priorities. Faculty leaders should also be involved in the process of determining faculty hiring priorities, as the institution begins to add new full-time positions.
4. **Junior faculty members reported that it is difficult for them to find time to engage in professional development activities.** Other universities have responded to this challenge by offering a voluntary seminar for faculty on college teaching. Junior faculty could receive a course load reduction (reassigned time) to participate in a year-long or semester-long institute on college teaching and learning. The institute or seminar could be led by a senior faculty member at Western, 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. Several universities convene these types of voluntary seminars; they are sometimes referred to as "faculty learning groups." If

properly supported, faculty learning groups could revitalize Western's approach to faculty development.

## **Qualitative Analysis: Section 5**

### **Librarians, Coaches/Trainers, Counselors, and Part-Time Faculty**

Due to the comparatively small number of survey respondents among part-time faculty, as well as the small number of full-time and part-time librarians, coaches/trainers, and counselors employed at Western, the survey data for those groups will be analyzed in a separate, system-wide report. In this report for Western, however, we will address salient issues, which emerged for each group in interviews and focus groups.

It is important to note that many part-time faculty, as well as librarians, coaches, trainers, and counselors, indicated a great deal of appreciation for being included in this study. As they stated on numerous occasions, they are AAUP members as well, yet as smaller constituencies within the collective bargaining unit, they feel that their issues and concerns are sometimes marginalized – not only by the administration, but sometimes by the AAUP itself. The vital roles that these professionals play in fostering student learning at Western should be widely recognized and appropriately acknowledged.

#### **Part-time faculty**

Part-time faculty indicated that the university provides minimal orientation or professional development that addresses their needs. A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, 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 also indicated that they received no orientation to their instructional roles at Western. A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, recalled that "my orientation consisted of being told, 'classes start in three days, get the books and get ready.'"

In addition to limitations in professional development and orientation, part-time faculty also reported a tension between themselves and the full-time faculty. The lack of communication between full-time and part-time faculty has prevented the part-time faculty from contributing their insights to discussions of curriculum, and has also interfered with the ability of part-time faculty to develop a deeper understanding of the program's intended learning goals and objectives. A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, stated that "as adjuncts, we go in, do our jobs, and leave campus. There is no dialogue [with full-time faculty]."

Part-time faculty mentioned that full-time faculty occasionally make comments that disparage part-time faculty members' contributions to the university. For example, when full-time faculty criticize the university for relying too extensively on part-time faculty, part-time faculty members may interpret those comments as criticisms of their teaching practices. In fact, some full-time faculty members made comments that could be interpreted by part-time faculty as criticisms of their performance. A department chair in arts and sciences, for example, noted that:

The adjunct faculty are not contractually required to keep office hours and they can be difficult for students to reach, so the students will take their complaints directly to the chair... And they [part-time faculty] do tend to choose multiple choice tests as their primary assessment tool. We [full-time faculty] see the limitations of that, but the adjuncts don't, and so their use of multiple choice tests has a direct effect on the curriculum and it affects the teaching that they do, and the quality of the courses that they teach. I mean, I don't blame them at all for opting out of doing the extra work that the full-time faculty do, because I think that they are already being exploited financially.

Likewise, a full-time faculty member in arts and sciences declared, "Thank God the contract places limits on the number of adjuncts. Otherwise, they would be teaching the majority of the classes."

For their part, part-time faculty noted that they are not always welcome at department meetings, and that the communication they receive from the department is limited or condescending. A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, indicated that:

For the past five years, adjunct faculty have not been invited to department meetings. We were invited in previous years, but not recently. We are ignored. There is an unspoken attitude among the full-time and part-time faculty, which is an 'us versus them' attitude. We have been spoken down to and made to feel like we have no status or nothing of value to offer... When the chair communicates to us [part-time faculty], it is mainly the chair telling us what we can't do, like we can't request secretarial help because it is not in the union contract, and things like that.

Communication with full-time faculty is further constrained, because the evaluation process for part-time faculty relies almost exclusively on student evaluation scores; part-time faculty have few opportunities to talk with and receive feedback on their teaching from full-time faculty. Part-time faculty were also concerned that these limited evaluation practices would have negative repercussions on academic program quality. As a part-time faculty member in arts and sciences noted, "From an overall improvement aspect, there should be some [classroom] observation [of part-time faculty]."

Furthermore, part-time faculty expressed concerns regarding the university's cap on the number of classes that they can teach each semester. They argued that part-time faculty should be allowed to teach more than two courses per semester. They also noted that there are few opportunities for part-time faculty to teach courses at

**Part-time faculty indicated that they receive little feedback on their teaching. Evaluations are limited to student course evaluations, and even those results are not always readily available.**

A part-time faculty member in a professional field, for example, stated that "student evaluations are the only method that we have, but again, sometimes those results are difficult to obtain. To get my evaluations last fall, I had to request them myself... I don't think I would have gotten them unless I specifically asked for them. We don't get feedback of any kind on a regular basis."

Likewise, a part-time faculty member in arts and sciences reported that "I don't have a clue about how the student evaluation results are used. It all goes back to the office, and a year later, we get to see them."

Western during the summer. A part-time faculty member in arts and sciences, for example, 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.” Similarly, a department chair in arts and sciences explained that “I could in fact use them [part-time faculty] to teach more.”

Finally, part-time faculty expressed concerns regarding job security. They were concerned that the university would increase class sizes, reduce the number of sections offered, and therefore hire fewer part-time faculty. As a part-time faculty member in arts and sciences noted, “Job security is an issue, in light of the cut back in funding. We don’t know where we stand. We don’t know what will happen, who will get laid-off. We don’t know if the full-time faculty will take over all the adjunct positions. So the budget cuts are a major, major concern.”

Despite the need to engage part-time faculty more extensively in departmental discussions of curriculum and learning outcomes, part-time faculty reported that they are largely disconnected from matters within their departments. University leaders at Western should take actions to improve the work environment for part-time faculty and establish a stronger basis for collaboration between part-time and full-time faculty.

- 1. Orientation and professional development opportunities need to be enhanced for part-time faculty members at Western.** The university could first conduct a needs assessment to determine what part-time faculty members believe are their most important faculty development needs. Then, Western could develop a series of professional development activities and orientation sessions, which are designed to address the needs and expectations of part-time faculty. Moreover, faculty development workshops at Western may currently be scheduled at times that are not convenient for part-time faculty members, who may have full-time day jobs or teach at multiple institutions. Western should, therefore, consider allocating resources to develop alternative delivery mechanisms for faculty development programs, such as webcasts and blogs, which would be available to part-time faculty at any time.
- 2. Western should extend its evaluation practices for part-time faculty.** Part-time faculty indicated that they receive minimal feedback on their teaching. Primarily, the feedback that they receive is in the form of student course evaluation results. They typically do not have opportunities to discuss their teaching with department chairs or full-time faculty colleagues. Additional modes of formative evaluation, including classroom observations and feedback sessions, should be developed for part-time faculty.

Part-time faculty issues are analyzed and discussed further in the system-wide report.

## Librarians

Librarians at Western reported a high level of satisfaction with shared governance and with the promotion and tenure process. Regarding governance and decision making in the library, a full-time librarian noted that “governance works well. We have a lot of autonomy. We meet with the director, but we also have our own faculty meeting. Everything on policy matters that the director communicates to the administration goes from the faculty.” Another study participant suggested that a high level of autonomy for librarians is compatible with their status as academic professionals:

We have a very high degree of autonomy. But we are all very accountable to each other. We are responsible to do the right thing, the right thing by the students, the faculty, and the university, and by our profession as a whole. Being a professional, you know what you have to do, but no one needs to be there telling us what to do.

In terms of promotion and tenure, librarians were confident that the process would acknowledge the unique aspects of their work context and appropriately assess their work performance. A full-time librarian noted that “librarians have done well in the P&T process at Western. The P&T committee always has one representative from the librarians, coaches, and counselors group.”

Departments at Western have created their own guidelines for the promotion and tenure process, which aim to clarify discipline-specific expectations for faculty performance. The library has produced its own set of guidelines, and librarians have noted the benefits of these guidelines for conveying to multiple constituencies the unique qualities and expectations of librarianship. As a full-time librarian noted:

We have an excellent record in our library on tenure and promotion. We do a great job of mentoring each other... The P&T criteria are clear, and we have our own guidelines. The Senate requested that departments develop their own guidelines for promotion and tenure, so that clarified it even further [in the library].

Library staffing levels, however, were viewed as problematic. Library functions were covered by a bare minimum of library faculty, while many support staff positions remained unfilled. A full-time librarian explained how limited staffing levels make it difficult for librarians to pursue professional development opportunities: “A big problem is time. When one of us goes off to a conference, then we are so low-staffed that someone has to fill in the reference shift. I am going to a conference in my field for the first time in years, because the date falls within an optimal window [where it does not negatively impact the schedules of other librarians].”

As a further concern, librarians indicated that more effective coordination is needed between the library and the university computing office. Specifically, librarians argued that the computing office maintains such tight control over systems and servers that innovation is stifled. A full-time librarian noted that the computing office 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.” Another librarian noted that:

There’s a push and pull between the library and IT. There is a very tight hold on systems... That may be good in some situations, but when you are trying to develop new ways of doing things and need a little bit of freedom, it becomes a hindrance... There is some resistance to giving autonomy for server space and to have applications run on those servers, and all that goes with it... They are the police on the playground; they are not there to help build things.

Workload issues for librarians are analyzed and discussed further in the system-wide report.



## Coaches/trainers

Coaches and trainers described a demanding workload, which they believe is not well understood by other constituencies within the university. As one full-time coach noted, “There’s no such thing as a 40-hour work week. We don’t know what a two-day weekend is.” Another study participant 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.

Workloads are further complicated by not having full-time assistant coaches and by limitations in the number of support staff within the athletic department. A full-time coach, for example, described the athletic department as a “bare bones operation,” which does not have enough staff to manage events or prepare for contests. Another study participant explained the lack of full-time assistant coaches in terms of salary levels for head coaches.

We have no full-time assistant coaches... Salaries for head coaches in the Connecticut state system are set at a rate higher than elsewhere. This means that we can’t afford to bring in assistant coaches at the full-time level, other than for football. So for assistant coaches, we rely on a pool of part-time people, often school teachers, who can come in late afternoon to assist with the sport. My ideal would be to hire full-time assistants who could cover two sports.

Another study participant explained how Western’s limited athletics facilities affect the workloads of trainers. “Athletic trainers are stretched. Limited facilities means that events must share a field and can’t overlap in schedule. For trainers, that means that they may have to come in early in the morning, and stay late into the evening to cover all the practices and competitions.”

Coaches also indicated that they are expected to be increasingly involved in promoting student learning. As one coach 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, including the loss of work-life balance. As a full-time coach explained:

Work-life issues are a big one, because coaching involves weekends, and Monday through Friday, when you are in season. Just making sure you have enough time to deal with your students as well as your personal home life is a real challenge.

Workload issues for coaches and trainers are analyzed and discussed further in the system-wide report.

## Counselors

Study participants indicated that the counseling center has a staffing level of three full-time counselors. The counselors described high clinical case loads, as well as growing mental health needs within the student population. A full-time counselor explained that:

The number of students returning from wars has meant that the counseling center is dealing with more cases of post-traumatic stress... There is an increase in the number of students on [mental health] medication in high school and have expectations that they bring to college. These students can become frustrated that they have to seek out services themselves... They expect that we would all come together and get them what they need.

A counselor also noted that the director of the counseling center has attempted to respond to these challenges and “has made an effort to increase referrals to outside therapists, and that has created some [workload] relief.”

Counselors explained that, due to the small size of the counseling center, the director also serves as the Department Evaluation Committee (DEC). “In this department, the DEC is often just a single person, the director.” Thus, the evaluation of the director alone carries significant weight in promotion and tenure reviews for counselors.

Workload issues for counselors are analyzed and discussed further in the system-wide report.

## Conclusions

### Quantitative research findings

1. Full-time faculty at Western reported working an average of 53.4 hours per week, which is nearly equivalent to the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions (53.2 hours per week).
2. Full-time faculty at Western allocated more hours per week to undergraduate instruction than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions.
3. Full-time faculty at Western reported that they spent 173.4 hours on academic work during summer 2009 (not including summer teaching). This is the equivalent of more than four 40-hour work weeks, during the months for which faculty are not “on contract.”
4. Full-time faculty members at Western received an average of 12.16 load credits per semester, and 81.3% of those load credits were awarded for activity that pertains directly to instruction.
5. Reassigned time for research comprised 2.2% of the total load credits awarded to faculty at Western. The comparable percentages at the other CSU institutions were 4.2% at Central, 3.3% at Southern, and 1.4% at Eastern.
6. Reassigned time for curriculum development comprised 7.9% of the total load credits awarded to faculty at Western. The comparable percentages at the other CSU institutions were 10.3% at Southern, 4.5% at Eastern, and 4.4% at Central. Thus, Western and Southern awarded comparatively more load credits for curriculum development than did Eastern and Central.
7. At Western, 38.7% of all load credits awarded for instruction were earned by part-time faculty members. The 2007-2011 collective bargaining agreement specifies that no more than 20% of instructional load credits should be attributable to part-time faculty.
8. Faculty at Western earned an average of 2.27 non-instructional load credits per semester. Comparatively, faculty at Southern received 3.18, faculty at Central received 2.10, and faculty at Eastern received 1.70.
9. The academic departments that carried the highest number of instructional load credits per semester were chemistry (11.88), music and music education (11.19), biology (10.88), health promotion and exercise science (10.70), and nursing (10.62). Three of these departments (chemistry, biology, and nursing) have large numbers of lab-based courses. The number of instructional load credits for these departments would have been even higher, if the university had allocated 1.0 load credit for each hour of lab class time. Therefore, this finding has important implications for the current method of assigning load credits for laboratory courses.
10. In order to award one load credit for each laboratory/studio hour taught, Western would need to allocate 20.4 additional load credits per year (beyond those already designated as supplemental lab credits).

11. Full-time faculty members who teach undergraduate courses at Western were more likely than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions to use the following teaching practices: multiple-choice exams, short-answer exams, student presentations, and peer feedback on student work. Full-time faculty members at Western were less likely than the national average to use the following teaching practices: essay exams and research papers and writing assignments. The limited use of research papers and the reliance on multiple-choice exams may be related to heavy teaching loads that limit the ability of faculty to engage in more time-consuming pedagogical practices.
12. The findings indicate that large majorities of full-time faculty at Western are actively engaged in experimenting with new teaching methods (84.1%), changing their teaching practices to get students more involved in their own learning (77.8%), and incorporating new instructional technologies into their courses (74.6%).
13. Survey findings indicated that 77.8% of full-time faculty at Western reported involvement in scholarly work that spans multiple disciplines; 68.3% reported that they participate in teaching enhancement workshops; and 66.7% reported involvement in mentoring new faculty.
14. Full-time faculty members at Western were less satisfied than the national average for faculty at “public master’s I” institutions with the following dimensions: institutional support for instructional technology, institutional support for teaching improvement, and workload.
15. Full-time faculty members at Western were less likely than the national average to believe that good teaching is rewarded by the institution, and that women faculty members are treated fairly at this institution.

### **Qualitative research findings**

1. Faculty indicated that Western’s 4-4 teaching load does not allow them to remain current within their academic fields and disciplines; therefore, they expressed concerns regarding whether they can deliver an innovative, cutting-edge curriculum to students.
2. Study participants noted that the 4-4 teaching load puts strain on junior faculty members who are not only preparing to teach many courses for the first time, but also are attempting to build research agendas that establish their impact in their respective fields and disciplines.
3. Faculty members explained that Western is attracting high quality students, yet their academic skills remain below what is required to succeed in college. Study participants indicated that they were willing to help under-prepared students build their academic skills, but they acknowledged that such work increased their workloads substantially.
4. Several faculty and administrators referred to Western’s strategic plan, which aims to align class sizes with enrollment levels recommended by the professional societies of various academic disciplines. Some faculty described efforts to reduce class sizes in their departments, while others expressed apprehension that their class sizes would soon be raised.
5. Faculty in the sciences argued that not only is the teaching load heavy, but the system designed to account for faculty workloads discounts their efforts to promote student learning. They

argued that lab-based instruction is perhaps the most critical component of teaching and learning in the sciences, yet the university's load credit system does not appropriately acknowledge the workload associated with teaching lab-based courses.

6. Faculty members indicated that research expectations are rising, while teaching loads remain consistently high. This perception, in turn, generated a great deal of concern and anxiety regarding promotion and tenure reviews.
7. Despite the creation of P&T guidelines in each academic department, faculty in the sciences and faculty in professional fields expressed concerns that their research would not be evaluated appropriately by university P&T committees.
8. Study participants were supportive of the academic initiatives that have emanated from the strategic plan, but they expressed concerns regarding the workload implications of these initiatives. Accreditation, assessment, internationalization, and the first-year experience program were noted by study participants as initiatives that have affected the workloads of faculty and department chairs.
9. Department chairs indicated that administrative initiatives, data requests, and inefficient bureaucratic procedures made their workloads unsustainable.
10. Search committee chairs suggested that administrative coordination needs to be improved in order to foster an effective recruitment and hiring process.
11. Faculty in the School of Business raised a concern regarding the salary levels offered to prospective faculty. They attributed several failed searches to lack of competitive salaries.
12. Junior faculty 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.
13. Part-time faculty indicated that the university provides minimal orientation or professional development that addresses their needs.
14. The evaluation process for part-time faculty relies almost exclusively on student evaluation scores. In addition, part-time faculty members have few opportunities to talk with or receive feedback on their teaching from full-time faculty.
15. Librarians indicated that more effective coordination is needed between the library and the university computing office. Specifically, librarians argued that the university computing office maintains tight control over systems and servers and does not promote innovation.
16. Coaches and trainers described a demanding workload, which they believe is not well understood by other constituencies on campus. Their workloads are complicated further by not having full-time assistant coaches and by limitations in the number of support staff within the athletic department.

17. Counselors explained that, due to the small size of the counseling center, the director of the center also serves as the Department Evaluation Committee (DEC).

## Some initial recommendations

1. Western could designate a specific amount of reassigned time to be allocated to faculty who are engaged in innovative pedagogical practices. Faculty could receive reassigned time to participate in workshops or seminars on a specific innovative teaching practice that they want to implement in their courses.
2. University leaders need to assess the resource implications of pursuing accreditation for various academic programs, and acknowledge that reassigned time will be necessary in those fields in order to grant faculty the requisite teaching loads.
3. 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 university provides only partial load credit for teaching such courses. A potential response, here, would be to 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.
4. The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) at Western could convene open dialogues on teaching academically under-prepared students, and enable faculty to share effective practices with their colleagues. The university could also assess the academic support services currently provided to students, and determine the level and extent of support that students need. Then, faculty, staff, and administrators can work together to identify appropriate roles for faculty and staff in supporting academic skills development in the student population.
5. Western could examine its practices regarding the allocation of reassigned time for research. First, Western could create a number of multi-year awards of reassigned time for research. Faculty could receive, for example, a 3-3 teaching load over two or three consecutive years to accommodate more expansive lines of research inquiry (rather than simply rely only on single-semester allocations of reassigned time). Second, Western could establish a standard policy for providing reduced teaching loads to new, junior faculty. This practice would not only help junior faculty build their research agendas, but also assist in their pedagogical development for teaching.
6. In order to establish greater confidence in the P&T process, faculty and administrators at Western could develop a university-wide statement that endorses multiple forms of scholarship. Western could also establish stronger communication between departmental evaluation committees (DECs) and the university's P&T committee. Forums for open discussion among DEC chairs, P&T committee members, and university administrators could help all parties understand and interpret the broad range of scholarly contributions made by faculty at Western.
7. Study participants noted that the administrative infrastructure to support new strategic initiatives is severely limited. Staffing levels in administrative offices have not been able to keep pace with growth in enrollments and aspirations at Western. University leaders need to consider the resource implications of the strategic plan at Western, and identify the levels of faculty and staff support that are necessary to carry out new initiatives. Initially, the university may need to provide more reassigned time for faculty and chairs to engage in related strategic initiatives. For

the longer term, the university should develop a faculty and staff hiring plan, which would link future position allocations to specific initiatives in the strategic plan.

8. In order to support department chairs, Western should develop a more streamlined system for collecting and retrieving data related to assessment and academic program performance. Such a system would reduce the likelihood that chairs will receive multiple requests for the same data, or requests for data that should be readily available in centralized offices. Inefficient bureaucratic procedures should also be simplified. For example, on the issue of under-enrolled courses, the university should establish an earlier deadline for student registration (and perhaps a late fee for students who do not comply), so that students are encouraged to register for courses well in advance of administrative decisions to cancel low-enrollment courses. Such efforts would also decrease the number of enrollment cap overrides that students would typically seek after under-enrolled sections of the course had been cancelled.
9. In order to foster greater coordination and efficiency in the search process, a committee of administrators, faculty, and affirmative action staff could develop a procedures manual to guide faculty searches and specify the steps necessary at each stage of the search process.
10. Western can develop a voluntary seminar for faculty on college teaching. Junior faculty could receive reassigned time to participate in a year-long or semester-long institute on college teaching and learning. The institute or seminar could be led by a senior faculty member at Western, 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.
11. Western can conduct a needs assessment to determine what part-time faculty members believe are their most important faculty development needs. Then, Western could develop a series of professional development activities and orientation sessions, which are designed to address the needs and expectations of part-time faculty.
12. Additional modes of formative evaluation, including classroom observations and feedback sessions, should be developed for part-time faculty.



**APPENDIX**  
**Western Connecticut State University**  
**Open-Ended Survey Responses**

This appendix contains verbatim responses to open-ended survey items, from the spring 2009 and fall 2009 full-time and part-time faculty surveys. The data below were selected to represent various themes and findings that were highlighted in this report.

**1. Teaching loads and teaching effectiveness.**

- Most of the students entering WestConn are underprepared for college studies. They need a lot of help with reading, critical thinking, and writing. Faculty members are saddled with large classes where they cannot be any help to students. Faculty and students are equally frustrated at the present system.
- Lab preparation and supervision of senior research students requires significant hands-on time not really reflected in workloads.
- Grading of music theory homework is very time-intensive, since it's a class very focused on the writing and analysis of music. There were some weeks this semester that I spent nearly 20 hours grading homework for 68 students. It would be nice to have TAs or grading help for classes like music theory.
- Lack of diversity of faculty contributes to increased workload for those of us who mentor diverse student groups. There is no reduction in workload although a faculty member may feel compelled to assist students with additional advising/mentoring. These students have extended families who also call and appear in the office for advice. Do we turn them away? How do we live by our vision of a "Diverse University Community?"

**2. Research expectations, promotion, and tenure.**

- The 12-credit teaching load within the CSU system leaves no room for scholarly research. Sadly, we have to do both (teach 12-credit load every semester and publish) equally to stand a chance for tenure and promotion. Worse part, CSU continues to admit many unprepared students.
- I am very satisfied with my current job and hope that I will get tenure. I am just concerned about getting research done with all the teaching responsibilities that I have during the semesters.
- We have a very high teaching load (4x4) and in turn are expected to be also productive in research and be in touch with our discipline. The teaching load is very high and it is actually not helpful from the perspective of teaching as well because the more time you have on your research, the better a teacher you can become. It is ridiculous to have high expectations from an instructor with such a high teaching load. Students suffer in the end. I think the teaching load needs to be reduced to allow for continued intellectual growth of the instructor that will in the

end benefit his/her students. Also we should give more credit and value to advising, which takes considerable amounts of our time.

- Research universities do not teach 4/4. Nor do their faculty have to beg for the time to research. We have untold extra-contractual expectations, such as recruitment, which are not considered. We cannot be all things.
- Too many courses and advising and committee and administrative work to be very productive in the area of creative activity. Burnout is a problem.

### **3. Administrative initiatives.**

- The biggest challenge at WCSU is the lack of full-time faculty members available for day-to-day activities such as advising and mentoring. The burden on the current full-time faculty in this regard is huge. Additionally, the facilities are run-down, and it is very difficult to find funds to purchase badly needed equipment. In all, however, we have a fine university with a great faculty and a very supportive administration.
- Administration seems to have incredible leeway as to who gets what credit, e.g., the entire Ancell School of Business is now on a teaching load of 9 credits per semester, which was granted by the Academic Vice President so that they could engage in “scholarly activities.” The rest of the university must engage in their scholarship while teaching 12 > credits. Not fair.

### **4. Part-time faculty issues.**

- The union contract only allows adjuncts to teach two courses a semester at ALL of the state universities combined. For us adjuncts, that puts an unreasonable cap on our potential earnings. Why can't we teach 2 courses a semester at EACH of the state universities?
- With a studio course of 4.5 load hours, it is not possible to teach more than one course per semester; an arbitrary and detrimental restriction.
- There is no guarantee of acquiring at least two courses per semester. Lack of benefits is a big deterrent to part-time faculty work.
- I was just hired Full-Time after being Part-Time for two years, so I am pleased with the amount of recognition my department gives to all of my hard work.