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

Subcommittee of the EPRC:
Mary Boland (Chair), Kim Cousins, Joseph Jesunathada, Robert Ricco, and Barbara Sirotnik
To examine workload balance in light of semester conversion and the professional opportunities and demands offered by CSUSB’s new Strategic Plan.

To ensure that all tenure stream faculty have the same baseline opportunity to pursue innovative teaching and professional work.
How we currently fare in the CSU

Insights from the 2013 CSU Hoover Commission Responses and the 2003 Comparable Workload Study
CSU teaching load for tenure-stream faculty

- **12 WTU** per term for direct instruction
- **3 WTU** per term to indirect instructional activities.
HOURS WORKED BY CSU FACULTY

CSU estimates faculty work 50 hours per week, with between 11 and 15 hours dedicated to non-instructional service and professional development work.
HOW DO WE FARE COMPARATIVELY?
The 2003 Comparable Workload Study:

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

The challenge of too much and too little...
Example: High Impact Practices

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

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

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

**What are HIPS?**
- First-Year Seminars and Experiences
- Common Intellectual Experiences
- Learning Communities
- Writing-Intensive Courses
- Collaborative Assignments and Projects
- Undergraduate Research
- Diversity Courses/Global Learning
- Service Learning/Community-Based Learning
- Internships
- Capstone Courses and Projects
EXAMPLE: Increased Expectations for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mentoring students in R & CA requires dedicated time that SP does not recognize.
EXAMPLE: Increasing and Maintaining Tenure Stream Faculty Numbers

- **Goal 2.7 Objective 7:** Increasing Tenure Track Density (TTD) and decreasing Student to Faculty Ratio (SFR).

- **Strategy 3:** To reach 63% TTD and an SFR of 23.8 in five years, CSUSB should create a culture that supports healthy work-life balance to attract and retain faculty.

**CONCERNS:**

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

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

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

17% of CSUSB’s new hires between 2010 and 2014 have already left.
Workload in the quarter to semester conversion:
Possible configurations and implications
What’s happening at other semester CSUs?

- Baseline = maximum # of courses a TT faculty member is expected to teach (without course releases)
- A survey of 17 schools showed faculty teaching a baseline of 6, 7 or 8 courses per year.
  - 9 had 3/3
  - 8 had 4/4
  - 1 had 4/3
How might workload increase under 4-4? Consider these metrics:

- The combined number of students enrolled in all courses during a term
- The number of students coming to office hours at any one time
- The number of exams/papers/projects which must be graded concurrently
- The number of course preparations during a particular time period
- The number of class session preparations which must be completed per teaching day
- The pedagogical approach used and the related means of assessment and mentoring involved
Moving from 3-3-3 to 4-4 would increase faculty workload by 33%.

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

TT faculty members should be required to teach no more than three courses per semester.
PREFERRED MODEL:
3/3-unit classes per semester

- Reduction in contact hours = increased opportunity for professional development and the implementation of HIPS in classrooms.
- Allows the curriculum to be designed around a healthy 40 course graduation requirement (120 units).
- Facilitates parity across lower division and upper division courses and teaching loads.
- Facilitates transfer curriculum alignment.
- Should be possible despite 12/3 contract conventions as CBA officially did away with the 12/3 “rule” in 1995.
- Exceptions for specific courses could still be made as needed (i.e. lab classes, graduate classes, etc.)
Alternate Model:
3/4-unit classes per semester

- Provides only 30 courses for graduation per student (120 units),
- Difficult to design a rich GE curriculum without affecting majors; curtailing GE would hurt students and departments that are significant GE providers.
- Does not facilitate transfer curriculum alignment well.
- One positive note: Would not worsen our current TT workload.
Alternate Model: Mix of 3 & 4 unit courses

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

A matter of priorities...
Anticipated Revenue Increases by AY 2020-21:

Increased FTES should = $6,811,059
The Cost of Hiring Additional Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TT FTEF</th>
<th>NON-TT FTEF</th>
<th>TOTAL FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014 - 2015</td>
<td>382.1</td>
<td>261.4</td>
<td>643.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSUMPTION: Tenure track density 60% AND SFR 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty needed by 2020</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403.0</td>
<td>268.7</td>
<td>671.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional faculty needed</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of additional faculty hired 2014 to 2020</td>
<td>$2,090,800</td>
<td>$363,600</td>
<td>$2,454,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSUMPTION: Tenure track density 60% AND SFR 23.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty needed by 2020</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>423.3</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>705.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional faculty needed</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of additional faculty hired 2014 to 2020</td>
<td>$4,122,773</td>
<td>$1,040,924</td>
<td>$5,163,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSUMPTION: Tenure track density 63.6% AND SFR 23.8 (per Strategic Plan)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty needed by 2020</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>448.7</td>
<td>256.8</td>
<td>705.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional faculty needed</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of additional faculty hired 2014 to 2020</td>
<td>$6,662,739</td>
<td>-$229,059</td>
<td>$6,433,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The increase in revenue from FTES PLUS money budgeted in the Strategic Plan Implementation Proposal should be sufficient to pay for the increased expenses of course buyouts for Tenure Track FTEF.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSUMPTION</th>
<th>TT FTEF</th>
<th>Cost of 1 Course Buyout per TT FTEF</th>
<th>Annual Cost of New Faculty Hired by 2020</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Buyouts plus Cost of New Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% TT Density and SFR 25</td>
<td>403.0</td>
<td>$2,015,040</td>
<td>$2,454,400</td>
<td>$4,469,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% TT Density and SFR 23.8</td>
<td>423.3</td>
<td>$2,116,639</td>
<td>$5,163,697</td>
<td>$7,280,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.6% TT Density and SFR 23.8</td>
<td>448.7</td>
<td>$2,243,637</td>
<td>$6,433,681</td>
<td>$8,677,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSUMPTION</th>
<th>TT FTEF</th>
<th>Cost of 2 Course Buyouts per TT FTEF</th>
<th>Annual Cost of New Faculty Hired by 2020</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Buyouts plus Cost of New Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% TT Density and SFR 25</td>
<td>403.0</td>
<td>$4,030,080</td>
<td>$2,454,400</td>
<td>$6,484,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% TT Density and SFR 23.8</td>
<td>423.3</td>
<td>$4,233,277</td>
<td>$5,163,697</td>
<td>$9,396,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.6% TT Density and SFR 23.8</td>
<td>448.7</td>
<td>$4,487,274</td>
<td>$6,433,681</td>
<td>$10,920,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Where there’s a will, there’s a way

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