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Charge to the Work Group
In late October 2009, Provost Paul appointed the Curricular Parameters Work Group (PWG). Our charge was to produce a metric of faculty work—a tool to enhance and enable more deliberate academic planning. In particular, we were asked to

1. identify the different types of courses/learning experiences at Stetson;
2. suggest target enrollments, developed on pedagogically appropriate grounds, for these different experiences/course types;
3. consider how these courses/experiences might be equitably weighted in faculty load;
4. articulate what faculty at Stetson expect of a unit course; and
5. examine any other “curricular parameters” relevant to academic planning.

The full text of the written charge was made available to the University community on the Academic Planning website. Meeting minutes, status updates, and related documents were regularly posted on the “Curricular Parameters” page.

A metric of faculty instructional load can serve multiple aims: it can help ensure that different forms of instructional work are accurately represented and appropriately weighted in administrative reports on faculty workload. It can help make the different kinds of instructional work faculty do more transparent across disciplinary differences. It can help departments and programs incorporate a range of learning experiences in their curricula and construct optimal pedagogical (and economically sustainable) mixes of these experiences for students. Finally, it can help foster equity in faculty instructional load across disciplinary differences (as well as within disciplines), and it can help administrators identify those faculty eligible for overload compensation—and thus help ensure that overload work is more equitably compensated.
Whatever metric we developed had to be “economically sustainable”: Provost Paul advised us not to anticipate resources sufficient to reduce the standard faculty load below 3/3 (or the equivalent). Similarly, we knew we could not anticipate resources sufficient to sustain a curriculum comprised entirely of small, highly interactive classes or experiences (seminars, tutorials, and independent studies). The committee was not asked to identify optimal course type, target enrollment, or faculty load weight for any particular department or program: rather, our task was to identify course types, sizes, and weights that would apply regardless of the department or program in which a course or experience is offered.

It is perhaps worth pointing out, too, that we were not asked or empowered to make or to implement policy, but rather to advise the Provost on curricular parameters useful in academic planning and appropriate for Stetson University.

**Principles, Assumptions, and Commitments**
Throughout our work, we were guided by the following ideas and assumptions:

1. It was crucial that members of the committee seek to understand (and appreciate) faculty work outside their own disciplines, and to bring as much transparency as possible to any system of calculating faculty teaching load across disciplinary differences. Further, while each of us brought particular disciplinary commitments and expertise to our work, we did not see ourselves as advocates for any individual program, pedagogical style, course type, or College/School. 

2. The course types we identify are not intended to be prescriptive, now or in the future. In articulating defining features of existing courses, we do not mean to suggest that all courses will or should conform to these descriptions. Rather, we hope that distinguishing features of courses can serve as models for understanding the relationship between different kinds of learning experiences, pedagogically-appropriate target enrollments, and faculty load weights. 

3. While faculty work necessarily responds to program, curricular, student, and institutional needs, we strongly affirm the historical autonomy of faculty to be self-defining: individual faculty members must be free to make different choices as teacher-scholars and as members of the academic and local community. There is not—nor should there be—one way to be a faculty member at Stetson. Nothing in what follows is meant to suggest that there is or should be a normative template into which every faculty member must fit. 

4. We share a strong commitment to equity in faculty workload, holistically understood, within and across the disciplines. Department chairs and deans have a special responsibility (and the more detailed knowledge necessary) to foster equity in instructional assignments within the discipline over time, while responding flexibly to the teaching interests, expertise, and other responsibilities (whether in or outside the Department) of faculty in their areas.
Introduction/Overview
Our charge—to produce a metric of course types/learning experiences, target enrollments, and faculty load weights—led to an extended consideration of faculty work. Our understanding of faculty work, and our sense of how a unit course should count in faculty instructional load, became a foundational parameter, underpinning the metric presented on the course type chart and the commentary (as well as the recommendations) in the pages that follow.

Reviews of how other schools measure load, as well as reports from the Department of Education, the American Association of University Professors, and others, moved us away from credit hours or contact hours as the primary measure of faculty instructional work. Instead, we came to a more holistic understanding of that work to include everything that goes into teaching a course, both in and out of the classroom. In what follows, we suggest that it is reasonable to assume (for academic planning purposes primarily but perhaps also as a general guideline for faculty) that a unit course can be expected to require 10-12 hours of work for faculty, per week and on average during the semester. Given Stetson’s 3/3 load (or the equivalent), three unit courses would reasonably comprise roughly 75% of each full-time faculty member’s workload, leaving the equivalent of one unit each semester available for research and creative activity, advising and other work with students outside of class, and administrative/service assignments.

These assumptions—that a unit course requires roughly 10-12 hours weekly and constitutes roughly 25% of full-time faculty workload—provide a measure by which the relative load weight of other kinds of work (instructional and non-instructional) can be understood. It provides a way to include other “curricular parameters” such as overloads, course releases, etc., in academic planning.

We propose bringing directed research, independent studies, tutorials, and other independently supervised learning experiences into load: if these are highly valued experiences for students at Stetson, as we believe they are, they should be included in faculty load. We also support an idea that has been floated previously on numerous occasions: the implementation of a policy that would allow for course reductions for significant scholarly/creative activity.

As we worked on the course type list, target enrollments, and load weights, we soon perceived that they are all fundamentally related—at least in any system that values both excellence in students’ educational experiences and equity in faculty load. While target enrollments reflect pedagogical strategies and goals, they also provide a powerful way to foster equity in load across different courses and learning experiences: with appropriate target enrollments, for example, a writing or writing-intensive course becomes “equivalent” in load weight to a lecture course; an experiential learning course to a lecture/discussion course; private lessons/studio in the SoM to all of the above. The proportions of work required for each course, if taught well and in ways that maximize student learning, will naturally vary: the lecture course might require more preparation, the writing course more frequent and extensive feedback on student writing, the applied lessons/studio in Music individual as well as group/studio instruction—but all can reasonably carry the load weight of “1” if each course is capped at a level appropriate to the learning experience it offers to students and the work it requires of faculty.

If a unit course is understood to require roughly 10-12 hours, on average, over a semester, then we can foster a better and more equitable understanding of faculty load across the CAS, SoM, and SoBA. We can use the metric and load weights to understand, for example, how the School of Music’s rich array of courses, whether classroom and applied instruction, compare (in load) to faculty in the CAS or SoBA.
The attached course list matrix will, we expect and believe, be subject to ongoing review and refinement. But it also establishes principles by which subsequent decisions about target enrollments and load weights might be determined.

A core principle, then, in what follows, is the idea that—at least for academic planning purposes—a unit of faculty load weight can be equated to roughly 10-12 hours of faculty time. We suggest this model knowing (a) that it is notoriously difficult to quantify faculty work; (b) that it would be ill-advised to attempt to quantify everything that faculty do; and (c) that many of us—in order to realize our own high expectations for ourselves, our students, and Stetson—will continue to choose to devote even more time to our courses as well as to work not directly related to the curriculum.

Note on Process
We began by researching the ways in which other institutions determine faculty load and assign weights to different courses/learning experiences. We established a website/blog on which to share documents and other information. We sought, in particular, alternatives to the most common administrative reports on faculty work—cost analysis models (like the Delaware Study) that report “student credit hours generated” (SCHG) by individual faculty members or departments/programs.1 For, while SCHG reports provide an important tool for analyzing instructional costs, they reveal little about the actual work required to teach various courses or the value of different courses/learning experiences relative to institutional priorities and mission.

By December 2009, we had developed an initial draft of the types of courses taught at Stetson, which we discussed with the deans and associate deans of each college and school. (Provost Paul participated in each of these meetings as well.) In January 2010, we extended the conversation to include chairs in the various divisions in the College of Arts & Sciences (Humanities, Social Science, Natural Science, and Education/Counseling), faculty in the School of Music, and chairs in the School of Business. In February, we conferred with faculty involved in the Writing Program, study away programs with on-campus components, and others. Each of these meetings provided valuable perspectives that informed our work.

Note on Terminology
Throughout this report, we use “faculty load” or “faculty instructional load” to refer to teaching components of faculty work. “Faculty work” or “faculty workload” refer to the range of activities—teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/administrative work—that more broadly define the work faculty are expected to do, and, indeed, are required to do to earn tenure and promotion. As our charge was to consider curricular parameters as they pertain to faculty work, we focused on the instructional dimensions of that work—work related to courses (whether credit-bearing or not) in which students officially enroll, and experiences (required or elective) that count towards the degree(s) students seek. This was, of course, hard to do without occasionally venturing into more comprehensive understandings of faculty work.

---

1 Student credit hours generated = the number of credit hours multiplied by the number of students enrolled in a course.
Faculty Instructional Load

Historically, at Stetson and elsewhere, faculty instructional load has been measured by student contact or credit hours. Sometimes, instructional load has been used as the primary measure of workload more generally. However, as the following statement from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) points out, reports that use student credit hours or hours in the classroom as the primary measure of faculty load provide an incomplete and inaccurate picture of what is really involved in the instructional work faculty do:

In the American system of higher education, faculty “workloads” are usually described in hours per week of formal class meetings. As a measurement, this leaves much to be desired. It fails to consider other time-consuming institutional duties of the faculty member, and, even in terms of teaching, it misrepresents the true situation. The teacher normally spends far less time in the classroom than in preparation, conferences, grading of papers and examinations, and supervision of remedial or advanced student work. Preparation, in particular, is of critical importance, and is probably the most unremitting of these demands; not only preparation for specific classes or conferences, but that more general preparation in the discipline, by keeping up with recent developments and strengthening one’s grasp on older materials, without which the faculty member will soon dwindle into ineffectiveness as scholar and teacher. Moreover, traditional workload formulations are at odds with significant current developments in education emphasizing independent study, the use of new materials and media, extracurricular and off-campus educational experiences, and interdisciplinary approaches to problems in contemporary society. Policies on workload at institutions practicing such approaches suggest the need for a more sophisticated discrimination and weighting of educational activities.

(AAUP Statement on Faculty Workload, 191)

At Stetson, the transition to a course unit system has provided opportunities to separate measurements of “seat time” or “contact hours” from understandings of student learning. It similarly provides an opportunity to untangle measurements of credit hours or contact hours from our understandings of faculty instructional work. Certainly, in many disciplines, contact hours still provide information crucial to understanding instructional load; in some cases, especially when most work involved for faculty occurs in a classroom, studio, laboratory, or field site, contact hours really do provide the most important or the primary measure of that work. Yet, as the AAUP statement points out, most teaching involves work that is not accurately represented, captured, or quantified by measures of student contact hours or contact hours alone. The distribution of faculty instructional work—preparation (broadly understood), actual classroom teaching, contact or collaboration with students outside regularly scheduled classes, assessment/evaluation of student work, etc.—varies significantly both within and across disciplines. It varies, as well, among individual faculty members—or, even, for the same faculty member at different points in his or her career.

The use of “workload” in this statement illustrates the challenge of thinking clearly and consistently about faculty work: here, “workload” is used interchangeably with “instructional load,” blurring the distinctions between instructional load and broader conceptions of faculty work that include teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/administrative responsibilities.

Further, although detailed consideration of non-instructional faculty work lies outside the specific charge of the PWG, it is important to note that focusing on teaching alone provides an incomplete understanding of faculty work. To quote another AAUP statement,

[A] faculty member’s workload . . . properly should be seen as the aggregate of hours devoted to all the forms and demands of teaching, of scholarship and research and publication, and of the many varieties of professional service. Not only does a mere tally and consideration of “teaching hours” ignore members of the faculty who teach in laboratories, or in settings other than within the traditional classroom (as in studios, small-group tutorials, field work, or clinics); it also distorts the nature of academic work by minimizing the value of the integrated career and the synergistic nature of experience and judgment that come from engagement in the multiple dimensions of faculty work. . . . We distort the enterprise of higher education if we attempt to separate these endeavors, or to define them as essentially competitive rather than complementary.

(AAUP, The Work of Faculty, 196-7) 4

**Historical Inaccuracies in Measures of Faculty Work**

We have lived so long—at Stetson as elsewhere—with measuring faculty instructional load on “credit hour” or “contact hour” models that we take for granted the assumptions built into those models, the measures they provide, and the conclusions to which they lead. But a quick review of the historical calculation of load at Stetson reveals how problematic, crude, and potentially inexact models based on measurements of credits or contact hours alone can be. At Stetson, the official statement on teaching load has been “12 credit hours”—and, many years ago, faculty typically taught four 3-credit hour courses each semester. For at least twenty years, however, many if not most faculty members (at least in the College and School of Business) have taught three 3-credit courses each semester—by these measures, 9 credit hour loads or the equivalent. At the same time, faculty in the Natural Sciences and Modern Languages regularly taught 10-13 hour loads, while in the School of Music, the standard remained an 11 credit hour load (or an 18 hour equivalent contact hour calculation for applied teaching). This method of calculating load points to structural inequities in faculty load—at least, that is, if student credit hours (or contact hour equivalents) are an accurate measure of work associated with the courses faculty teach across the disciplines.

When the College converted to the course unit system in Fall 2009, courses that had been 3 credit hours were suddenly, at least for students, worth the equivalent of 4 credit hours each. Each unit course was “enhanced” (as expectations for student learning outside of official class sessions increased), but student/faculty contact hours generally remained the same. Using the credit hour method of measuring faculty work, then, in 2009-2010, faculty in the College, including most in Natural Sciences and Modern Languages, were suddenly teaching loads equivalent to 12 credit hours; faculty in the School of Music were still teaching loads equivalent to 11 credit hours; and faculty in the School of Business were still teaching loads equivalent to 9 credit hours. Was this a more—or less—accurate measure of the actual work required in different courses and disciplines for faculty? Given that the new course unit system emphasized deepening student learning and engagement outside officially scheduled class sessions, and given that the most common load for faculty in the College remained 3 courses a semester, to conclude

that faculty in the College experienced a 33% increase in instructional load in the conversion to course units would be, we think, to distort the realities of instructional work for most if not all faculty.\(^5\)

Quite apart from the conversion to the course unit system, it has never been clear that student credit hours, contact hours, or even student credit hours generated provide the most accurate or reliable measures of faculty work within or across disciplines. While student credit hours generated ["number of students enrolled" x "credit hours"] enables a more nuanced analysis insofar as it represents not only how many students a faculty member is teaching but how many contact hours the class likely requires, class size (while significant) and contact hours (also significant) do not represent the most holistic or comprehensive understanding of the work required for faculty in different courses.

Historically, a guiding assumption at many colleges and universities has been that every hour of lecture required at least two hours of preparation. Thus, a course meeting 3 hours a week was assumed to require, on average, at least 9-10 weekly hours of faculty time. Generally, too, schools have recognized that laboratory and studio courses require less work outside of class, perhaps one hour instead of two for every contact hour. Such courses, then, were assumed to require around 6 weekly hours of faculty time and thus counted as roughly 2/3 of a regular course (sometimes more, sometimes less, depending upon the discipline or the particular course) in faculty load. These assumptions seem increasingly questionable, given changes in pedagogical styles and practices that emphasize more faculty/student interaction, more frequent and complex forms of assessment, more writing-intensive courses, and more demands on faculty time.

### National Data on Faculty Work

Self-reported national data consistently show that full-time faculty routinely work 45-55 hours per week, regardless of discipline:\(^6\)

> Data show that on average faculty members routinely work somewhere between 45 and 55 hours per week. Workload should be thought of as total professional effort, which includes the time (and energy) devoted to class preparation, grading student work, curriculum and program deliberations, scholarship (including, but not limited to, research and publication), participation in governance activities, and a wide range of community services, both on and off campus.

> (AAUP, The Work of Faculty, 197)

According to the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (conducted by the U.S. Department of Education), the average self-reported hours for full-time instructional faculty in Stetson’s Carnegie

---

\(^5\) We do not mean to suggest that there was no additional work involved for faculty in the CAS in the transformation to the new course unit system: most developed new courses or significantly rethought existing ones. Further, increased expectations for students outside of class has in many cases led to new assignments that require faculty feedback or evaluation.

\(^6\) Data reported by the AAUP and in the NSOPF are confirmed in other studies (Wimsatt, Trice, & Langley, 2009; Cataldi, Bradburn, & Fahimi, 2005; Conley 2002).
classification (private not-for-profit master’s institutions) is 51.8. For all program areas in all types of 4-year institutions, the average is 54.3 hours. While we did not have access to data specific to Stetson, we felt it was reasonable to assume that, at Stetson, disciplinary expectations and conventions, as well as individual work habits, conform to national standards. It thus also seemed reasonable to assume, at least for the purpose of this study, that self-reported national averages approximate, at least, the experience of faculty at Stetson. But we realize that for any number of reasons the experience of faculty at Stetson—overall and/or in specific programs or disciplines—may not conform to these averages: it would take additional study to assess whether or not this is the case.

Of course, these numbers describe the status quo. They do not tell us what we—as a community—believe a reasonable work load for Stetson faculty to be, what we feel the appropriate work week or distribution of work for faculty among teaching, scholarship/creativity and service should be, or the degree to which we want to consider workload in the context of other important principles, like work/life balance. Nor do they enable us to see whether there are significant differences among specific programs.

A more detailed breakdown of this aggregate data, by disciplinary/program area, including contact hours, is presented below. What is significant for the purposes of this report, however, is that the total number of self-reported hours per week does not differ significantly for faculty working in different disciplines. Regardless of disciplinary specialization, faculty report working roughly 52.9 to 54.7 hours per week. Thus, even if the reliability of self-reported data is questioned, the available evidence suggests that, nationally, faculty in all disciplinary areas regularly work roughly the same number of hours on average each week.

Total hours worked per week and classroom hours are reported in the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (2004):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Total Hours/Week</th>
<th>Classroom Hours/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 “National Study of Postsecondary Faculty,” U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, 2004. http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf/. Included sample of 1,080 public and private not-for-profit institutions and a sample of 35,000 faculty and instructional staff. Weighted response rates for the two surveys were 86 and 76 percent, respectively.

8 “Faculty at nearly every type of institution are spending more time engaged in research, teaching and preparing for teaching than they have in the past. . . . The percentage of faculty members who report working more than 55 hours a week grew from 13% in 1972 to 47% in 2003” (Leslie Wimsatt et. al, “Faculty Perspectives on Academic Work.” Journal of Research Administration, 2009).

9 Visual and performing arts—presumably Music and Theatre Arts faculty are included here.

10 History is included in Humanities.
The average hours faculty report spending in the classroom (8-11 hours/week) are close to what we would expect average hours in the classroom to be for faculty who teach a 3/3 load. In courses where contact hours, rather than work outside of class, represent most of the work required by faculty, reported weekly classroom hours will be considerably higher than these averages.

The average % of time devoted to the different dimensions of faculty work, for full-time faculty teaching in 4-year institutions, is also reported in the NSOPF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Administrative/other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At all 4-year institutions, the average percent of time faculty report spending on teaching is 57.7%; on research 21.5%; and on administrative/other 20.8%. At private not-for-profit master’s institutions like Stetson, faculty report spending significantly more time on teaching (68.7%), less on research (10.9%), and slightly more (20.4%) on administrative/other responsibilities.

If faculty teaching loads that require 8-11 hours/week in the classroom reflect (on average) 68.7% of total weekly work hours devoted to instructional work (51.8 at schools in Stetson’s Carnegie classification), then it seems safe to conclude that faculty with 3/3 teaching loads are spending roughly 35-36 hours/week on work related to teaching—up to 12 hours/week (at least on average) per course, and (at schools like Stetson) approximately 75% of the time devoted to teaching and other professional activities.

Given the demands of faculty work (at Stetson as elsewhere), we find it hard to imagine that most faculty can perform well as teachers, scholars, and active members of the community without working, on average, at least 45-50 hours/week during the academic term.

National data on faculty work suggests that, for the purposes of academic planning, it is reasonable to assume that each unit course (or the equivalent, composed of different learning experiences of varying weights) will require, on average, 10-12 hours per week of time, in and out of the classroom. The unit course, then, functions as the standard for measuring (and determining the equivalencies of) “1” unit in faculty load.

If 3 load units represent 75% (roughly 35-36 hours) of total weekly workload, then 25% (roughly 10-12 hours) remains available for research and creative activities, advising and other work with students outside the classroom, and administrative/service responsibilities.

Total faculty workload can also be expressed as the equivalent of 4 load units per semester, or 8 units in an academic year.

---

11 Social Sciences include area/ethnic/cultural/gender studies.
The Unit Course
A course provides an organized learning experience for students. Courses that carry a unit of credit might require 3, 4, or more contact hours each week. As most full-time students take four unit courses each semester, it seems reasonable to expect that each unit course will be organized so as to require, on average, 10 hours of work—in and out of class—for students each week.\(^{12}\) There will of course be times when a particular course will require more (or less) time. Still, as a general model, 10 hours/week (on average) provides, we think, a sensible point of reference and expectation for most courses that carry one unit of weight for students and one unit in load weight for faculty at Stetson.\(^{13}\) As a guideline (rather than a mandate), it expresses a general expectation of what we collectively believe the workload for faculty teaching a Stetson course should be, regardless of the discipline or school in which it is taught, so as to foster equity, consistency, and similar levels of rigor throughout the curriculum. Other courses and learning experiences should be weighted proportionately, and in ways that express a general expectation of what the workload associated with the course might reasonably be for faculty.

Course Types/Target Enrollments
The courses listed in the attached “Course Types” matrix are commonly taught at Stetson. In each case we offer a few defining features of the dominant pedagogical mode or practice; however, we recognize that some courses cross categories and might, on occasion, more closely resemble a different course type. The aim is not to be prescriptive or to suggest any normative way of organizing or teaching a course: it is to link the type of course with target enrollments that make sense pedagogically and promote equity in faculty load, across as well as within disciplines.

Target enrollments reflect what we believe to be, on the basis of our conversations with chairs and deans, pedagogically sound and economically viable enrollments for different course types, regardless of the discipline in which they are taught. We also considered national standards in key skill areas (writing courses, modern language instruction, applied music instruction/private lessons, and internship supervision/field experience in pre-professional areas like teacher education and counseling). In our discussions with deans, associate deans, chairs, and program directors, we found a high level of consensus on what pedagogically-appropriate target enrollments for different course types should be.

While we began by identifying target enrollments on pedagogical grounds, the ranges on the attachment also reflect our sense of target enrollments that warrant, in an equitable system of faculty weighted load, the load weight of “1.” For any number of reasons, individual courses might not actually enroll the number of students indicated by these ranges. Still, a shared and transparent understanding of what course capacities actually are, given the pedagogical practices and the desire for equity in faculty load, should enable academic leaders to determine the number of students a program can actually or ideally serve—given the number of faculty and the desired mix of courses/experiences in department/program curricula. Identifying target enrollments can bring greater clarity and transparency to academic planning efforts.

\(^{12}\) In a Spring 2009 conversation (led by Dean Ballenger) devoted to discussing expectations for student work in the new unit system, there was wide agreement among CAS faculty that 10 hours/week, on average, was a reasonable expectation for students in a unit course.

\(^{13}\) Separately scheduled labs in the natural sciences provide an exception to this model and may well require, together with the courses to which they are attached, more work/time for students. Labs are proportionately weighted, however, in faculty load.
Faculty Load Weights
We embarked on this project open to whatever faculty load weights seemed appropriate and equitable: if convinced that certain course types required more work on the part of faculty than others, we wanted that difference to be reflected in faculty load weights. And yet, identifying differences on the basis of reliable evidence about the effort/time it takes to teach a particular course proved elusive: while the kind of work a course requires might be distinctive, and while some faculty might choose to devote more or less time to a particular course, it was difficult for us to say, with confidence, that a certain kind of course consistently requires more work on the part of faculty. Further, in the face of national data suggesting that faculty meet disciplinary expectations in roughly the same number of hours per week, presumably by teaching what institutions perceive to be equitable loads, weighting some courses more or less seemed ill advised—at least on the basis of evidence available to us at this time. We perceived, as well, the value of simplicity over complexity: whenever possible, we opted to adjust target enrollments to foster load equity rather than develop a system of finely tuned incremental weightings. ¹⁴ At the same time, should a

Recommendation 1:
Target enrollments should be kept comparatively low in courses that explicitly aim to develop fundamental skills—language acquisition, writing, speaking, and/or creative arts. Such courses require a high level of student/faculty interaction and detailed evaluation of student work (often in addition to content delivery). Lower target enrollments make the load weight of these courses more equitable with load weight of other courses.

Recommendation 2:
Although theatre/play direction is not a course that students take for credit, the work involved for faculty is so extensive that we believe it should either be counted as a course in load or that faculty directing these performances should be given a course release for this work in the semester a play is in production.

Recommendation 3:
The teaching work that faculty do supervising independent studies, directed research, and other forms of individualized instruction should be included in calculations of load. The load weights assigned to these experiences, whether high- or low-intensity, express an understanding of what the work associated with the course/experience for faculty might be, relative to other forms of instructional work.

¹⁴ There is some evidence to suggest that the more complex and less transparent a workload model, and the more it attempts to detail and quantify every aspect of faculty work, the less satisfied faculty become, and the more they feel the model creates a false sense of accuracy. Iris Vardi, “The impacts of different types of workload allocation models on academic satisfaction and working life.” Higher Education 57.4 (April 2009). 499-508.
convincing case be made in the future that a particular course type be given additional weighting, such evidence should be considered carefully in the context of the important goal of fostering equity in load across disciplinary differences.

Many institutions with a 3/3 teaching load use a 75:25 formula to articulate—however imperfectly or imprecisely—the relationship between instructional and non-instructional components of faculty work. In such a formula, roughly 75% of a faculty member’s average work week is assumed to be related to instructional activities; the remaining 25% accounts for the other kinds of work faculty are expected to do. It is a reasonable formula for Stetson to adopt: it provides guidance for both faculty and administrators on what a desirable balance of faculty work might be; the 75:25 model articulates, as well, an understanding of the degree of depth, rigor, and work that should be involved in a unit course taught at Stetson, regardless of the discipline or school in which the course is taught. The model also has the advantage of conveying to faculty how their own work might be balanced in order to develop the qualities and credentials Stetson expects for tenure and promotion.

A holistic understanding of what is involved in teaching a unit course (or its equivalent in other kinds of instructional work) thus led us to an understanding that, on average and irrespective of discipline, a Stetson unit course will likely require 10-12 weekly hours of faculty time: in some—perhaps most—courses, this time will include 3-4 contact hours + 7-8 hours of preparation, assessment, and work with students outside of regularly scheduled class sessions. The time will be apportioned differently in different courses—some courses will, for example, require more contact time but require less time for preparation and/or assessment. Still, the assumption articulated here is that in general and on average, most unit courses, regardless of discipline, can be taught well within these parameters and thus should receive equal weight in load. Any distinctive or unusual demands on faculty for a particular course should also be taken into consideration when load weights are assigned.

Using this basic paradigm, we assigned weights to the very different kinds of courses and learning experiences at Stetson, as summarized in the chart on below. More detailed information is provided on the “Course Type” matrix that accompanies this report. One of our greatest challenges was developing weights for the various kinds of instruction in the School of Music. We sought, in conversations with SoM deans and faculty, weights that were consistent and equitable, within the SoM itself, in the context of the work faculty do in the CAS and SoBA, and in relation to the weight of "1" assigned to the full unit course. It is perhaps bears repeating that we assigned weights based on our best sense of the actual work involved, relative to the time required to teach a unit course weighted as "1". We did not seek to ensure any particular outcome. We did not seek to ensure, for instance, that subsequent analysis will reveal that existing SoM loads are equitable (or, for that matter, inequitable) with faculty loads in the CAS or SoBA. In fact, we do not know at this point in time what the resulting analysis, once load weights are assigned to the courses faculty teach, will show for any department, program, or College/School.
Our analysis admittedly does not take into account differences in the nature of the work itself, though we acknowledge that some work within each of the disciplines requires a high degree of energy or concentration, some requires less, and that these degrees of intensity fluctuate—even for the same instructor—over the course of a term. We recognize, as well, that some faculty might be able to work more “efficiently” than others, and that some—in order to realize their own ideals and standards—may choose to work harder or longer than others on the same course, or teach their section of a course differently from their colleagues. All of which is to say, again, that faculty work resists easy quantification: while more complicated formulas might be developed to reflect these and other variables, at the end of the day the resulting system would be complex, opaque, and may not—despite the best intentions—result in any greater degree of equity or fairness. But we do think that the system we are proposing, if properly administered, can control for the most egregious inequities, if not in any one semester, then over time. Further, it provides some guidance as to the work generally required to create and sustain high levels of academic quality in Stetson unit courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load Weight</th>
<th>Average Work Required (weekly)</th>
<th>Representative Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-12 hours</td>
<td>Lecture; Lecture/Discussion; Discussion; Seminar; Writing/Composition; Modern Language; Studio Arts; Major Ensembles; Applied Lessons/Studio (SoM)—the majority of courses fall into this category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>8-10 hours</td>
<td>Some Natural Science Labs-dependent upon contact hours + intensity of work; Medium Ensembles; Skills-Lecture/Lab (medium intensity/contact hours - SoM); Lecture/Discussion with limited contact hours + less intensive prep/assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6-8 hours</td>
<td>Many Natural Science Labs-dependent upon contact hours + intensity of work; Small Ensembles (fewer contact hours- SoM); tutorials (3-5 students); Skills-Lecture/Lab – fewer contact hours/prep – SoM; some Dept. seminars/colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>Skills—Lecture/Lab—fewest contact hours/prep—SoM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20 per student</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Directed research/study/field experience—high intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 per student</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Directed research/study/field experience—low intensity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Instructional Load
We affirm the value of an integrated faculty career, as articulated in the AAUP statement quoted earlier in this document. We believe such a career to be in the best long-term interests of faculty, students, and the University. This commitment underscores the importance of an equitable system that makes space for faculty to be self-defining, and to make choices different from one another; it underscores the importance of ensuring that the demands of instructional work do not compromise scholarly/creative development and productivity or eliminate opportunities to be involved in various forms of service or administrative work. It also underscores the importance of ensuring that all faculty have ongoing opportunities for intellectual and creative development (and renewal).

As noted earlier, we suggest that in calculations of faculty work, teaching should comprise roughly 75% of a full-time t/t (or tenured) faculty member’s workload most of the time, with the remaining 25% available for scholarly/creative pursuits, service/administrative work, and advising or other work with students outside the classroom. This 75% is represented by 6 load units in an academic year, and while the assumption is that most faculty will teach 3 load units in a semester, the annual total might be achieved more flexibly—for instance, a faculty member may accrue 3.5 load units in one semester and 2.5 in the other.

Recommendation 4:
Most unit courses should carry faculty load weight of “1”: courses with separately scheduled lab experiences carry additional weight, as do those (primarily major ensembles in the School of Music) that enroll more than 50 students and/or carry additional responsibilities like recruiting. Incremental weightings might be added, with the approval of the Dean and Provost, to any course or learning experience that requires demonstrably more work on the part of faculty.

Recommendation 5:
Faculty who participate in team-teaching should be given full load credit when responsibility for the course is shared throughout the semester. In instances where responsibility is shared but distributed in various proportions throughout the semester, proportionate weight should be assigned (so long as a faculty member participates for at least 3–4 weeks). The same principle applies for senior projects jointly supervised by faculty in different departments, regardless of the department in which the student registers for the capstone project.

Recommendation 6:
In some areas of the University, teaching multiple sections of the same course has been discouraged or prohibited by policies that have, historically, been unevenly enforced. Chairs and deans should have the flexibility to assign multiple sections of the same course to a faculty member when doing so fosters greater equity and/or efficiency within the Department, assuming that the welfare of students and faculty is not harmed. In such instances, the two sections should count as two full units in a faculty member’s load.
We support, too, creative distributions of load that clearly enhance students' educational experience at Stetson, including the possibility of spreading out an annual load into times outside the regular semester, as might be the case in a May study away or study abroad experience for which students earn academic credit. While Stetson may not be able to support many such experiences in one academic year, it seems feasible—and desirable—to enable a faculty member to teach a 3-2-1 load that spills into the May summer term (or, what may be even more likely, a 3-2.5-.5 load, with in-class instruction during the Spring term and study away in May).

**Recommendation 7:**
Faculty instructional load should be calculated on an annual basis; the 6 units that comprise annual load may be achieved flexibly, with (for example) 3.5 units accrued in one term and 2.5 in the other.

**Recommendation 8:**
Faculty should be given the opportunity (if not actively encouraged) to develop innovative "study away" courses that involve classroom meetings during the regular semester and off-campus experiences outside the regular academic calendar; faculty should have the option of counting such courses—unlike summer school—as part of regular, annual instructional load. (Such loads might be calculated as 3-2-1 or 3-2.5-.5, depending upon the structure of the course or experience.)

**Instructional Overloads**
We believe instructional overloads should be rare, that they should be voluntary (whenever possible), that they should be compensated more equitably, and that they should be discouraged as a regular practice for an individual faculty member over successive semesters. When faculty are consistently expected to teach overloads, they are unable to devote to each class the time and energy it deserves. Further, they lack opportunities available to others to foster their own creative/intellectual development; and they cannot participate in the life of the university to the same degree as their colleagues. Thus, they are denied the chance to develop the kind of integrated career described above, and they may be disadvantaged, as well, in the tenure and promotion process. These long-term impacts are not desirable for the faculty member, and they are not in the best interest of the University.

We support flexibility in the determination of overload compensation, even as we maintain that such compensation should be equitable across the university. Options for compensation for annual instructional loads that exceed the standard 6 units might include:

1) “Banking” overload units for a reduced load in a future semester. In our view, overload units should not “expire,” though perhaps only one overload unit (or less) should be approved or used for a course release within any 2-3 year period.

2) Faculty may elect to be paid for overload units accrued, at rates proportionate to compensation for a unit course (thus,.5 unit would be paid at ½ the regular overload rate for teaching a course.)
3) In lieu of compensation or “banking”, faculty should be able to negotiate significantly reduced service/administrative/advising responsibilities for any extended period in which teaching responsibilities exceed the standard instructional load. They should confer, as well, with their Department Chair and Dean in order to understand fully the potential impact on tenure and promotion.

**Recommendation 9:**
Any egregious inequities in faculty load should be addressed immediately: resolving such inequities deserves priority consideration in academic planning.

**Recommendation 10:**
In no semester should a faculty accrue more than 4 load units (or the equivalent); it should be exceedingly rare for a faculty member to accrue 8 or more load units in any regular academic year. Untenured faculty, in particular, should not be assigned to teach overloads.

**Recommendation 11:**
Stetson’s overload compensation policy should be transparent and equitably applied, across the different academic divisions and disciplines. Faculty should have the option of “banking” overload units, or receiving compensation.

**Adjunct and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**
This new articulation of faculty work, which recognizes that contact hours do not always accurately reflect the work required to teach a course, suggests that the adjunct compensation at Stetson should be reviewed and compensation increased.

Lecturers and other non-tenure-track faculty with no service, advising, or administrative responsibilities, and who are not expected to engage in scholarship or creative activities, should be contracted (and appropriately compensated) for up to four courses a semester. Those with responsibilities comparable to tenure-track faculty might be contracted for 3/3 or 4/3 loads instead. Those without these responsibilities but who prefer a 3/3 load could have their compensation adjusted accordingly.

**Non-Instructional Faculty Work:**
**Scholarly/Creative Development, Advising, and Administrative/Service Responsibilities**
Although faculty work outside the curriculum falls beyond the explicit charge of this committee, a comprehensive picture of faculty must include scholarship/creative activity, student advising, and administrative/service responsibilities. Further, these non-instructional dimensions of faculty work impact academic planning and the curriculum (course releases for heavy service responsibilities take a faculty member out of the classroom). If we assume that faculty should be able to devote roughly 25% of their time (the equivalent of 2 load units) during the academic year to work that is not directly related to teaching, that all faculty should be engaged in active forms of professional/intellectual/creative development, and that all faculty will be engaged in significant service and advising, then those asked to
assume significant and time-consuming work in advising as well as administration/service should be released from other responsibilities and/or compensated appropriately.

We support the continuation of course releases and stipends for significant service/administrative work:

1 course release/semester = work equivalent to teaching one course (10-12 hours/week)  
Examples—chair of large department (10+ faculty); chair of Faculty Senate

1 course release/year: equivalent to .5 unit each semester (8-10 hours/week)  
Examples—chair of medium department (5-9 FTE faculty); program chairs with comparable curricular and/or co-curricular responsibilities

We support, too, the creation of a policy that would allow course reductions and releases for faculty engaged in significant scholarly/creative activity. Of course, we recognize that any such policy would have to be economically sustainable and thus might need to be limited to a certain number of releases in any given year.

Some faculty carry very high advising loads: it seems reasonable either to compensate faculty for these loads, to reduce (if possible) other service responsibilities, or some combination of both. Deans have the responsibility for ensuring that advising and service assignments are as equitable as possible within their College or School; the Provost has the responsibility for fostering equity within the University’s academic programs more generally.

**Recommendation 12:**
In order to ensure high quality advising to students, faculty members’ advising loads should not exceed 20 students.

**Recommendation 13:**
The University should develop more reliable ways of measuring the non-instructional/service elements of faculty work, with particular attention to instances in which “excessive” service responsibilities prevent faculty from developing as fully as they otherwise might as scholars and creative artists. While unconvinced of the value of attempting to quantify every aspect of faculty work, we feel that fractional load credit might be provided for significant responsibilities—including advising—that exceed ordinary expectations by a significant margin.

**Recommendation 14:**
The University should provide opportunities for course reductions and releases not just for important service/administrative work but for significant scholarly/creative activity as well.
Concluding Comments:
We share—together with all members of the Stetson community—a strong commitment to equity in faculty teaching load and overall workload. Given the complexity and diversity of faculty work, both within and across disciplines, and the value of preserving and fostering the self-defining quality of faculty work, we realize how difficult that is—in part because of the different choices faculty make in how they work; in part because some faculty are asked to take on more time-consuming service or administrative responsibilities; in part because the work required to prepare and teach any particular course might differ even for the same faculty member at different points of his or her career. Other factors come into play as well: whether a new course requires substantive new preparation; whether a course requires more contact hours with students; whether a course requires intensive evaluation of student work; whether a course is one of multiple sections an instructor is teaching that term—and so on. In some disciplines, the most demanding courses might be introductory or general education courses that develop basic skills for all students; in others, they might be advanced courses for majors requiring specialized knowledge in the discipline; in some, they might be both.

Given all of the above, department chairs and deans have a special responsibility to ensure that instructional (and non-instructional) work is distributed as equitably as possible within programs and departments, while responding flexibly to faculty interests and expertise, and taking into consideration the credentials required for tenure and promotion. This would include the flexibility to assign someone with heavy service responsibilities or an especially intensive involvement in research/scholarship/creative endeavors a somewhat lighter teaching load, consisting, perhaps, of less demanding courses—at least for the period of time in which it is deemed to be in the best interest of the institution, our students, and the faculty to do so.

Although it was outside the charge of this committee to consider non-instructional or non-curricular workload parameters, we recognize that more nuanced measures of non-instructional work are crucial to a holistic (and equitable) understanding of faculty workload. For instance, the service work faculty do is not accurately understood by a simple tally of committee assignments: some committees require significantly more work than others. This is an area that deserves further study and analysis.

We believe the model we propose is (or can be, with careful academic planning) economically viable: while we do not yet know what an analysis of faculty instructional load (or overall workload) using the attached matrix will reveal, the matrix itself does not dictate—nor should it—the appropriate mix of courses and learning experiences for any program, department, or College/School. It merely provides an additional analytical tool that will, we hope, prove useful to those involved in making such determinations.
Summary of Recommendations
Curricular Parameters Work Group
April 2010

Recommendation 1:
Target enrollments should be kept comparatively low in courses that explicitly aim to develop fundamental skills—language acquisition, writing, speaking, and/or creative arts. Such courses require a high level of student/faculty interaction and detailed evaluation of student work (often in addition to content delivery). Lower target enrollments make the load weight of these courses more equitable with load weight of other courses.

Recommendation 2:
Although theatre/play direction is not a course that students take for credit, the work involved for faculty is so extensive that we believe it should either be counted as a course in load or that faculty directing these performances should be given a course release for this work in the semester a play is in production.

Recommendation 3:
The teaching work that faculty do supervising independent studies, directed research, and other forms of individualized instruction should be included in calculations of load. The load weights assigned to these experiences, whether high- or low-intensity, express an understanding of what the work associated with the course/experience for faculty might be, relative to other forms of instructional work.

Recommendation 4:
Most unit courses should carry faculty load weight of “1”: courses with separately scheduled lab experiences carry additional weight, as do those (primarily major ensembles in the School of Music) that enroll more than 50 students and/or carry additional responsibilities like recruiting. Incremental weightings might be added, with the approval of the Dean and Provost, to any course or learning experience that requires demonstrably more work on the part of faculty.

Recommendation 5:
Faculty who participate in team-teaching should be given full load credit when responsibility for the course is shared throughout the semester. In instances where responsibility is shared but distributed in various proportions throughout the semester, proportionate weight should be assigned (so long as a faculty member participates for at least 3-4 weeks). The same principle applies for senior projects jointly supervised by faculty in different departments, regardless of the department in which the student registers for the capstone project.

Recommendation 6:
In some areas of the University, teaching multiple sections of the same course has been discouraged or prohibited by policies that have, historically, been unevenly enforced. Chairs and deans should have the flexibility to assign multiple sections of the same course to a faculty member when doing so fosters greater equity and/or efficiency within the Department, assuming that the welfare of students and faculty is not harmed. In such instances, the two sections should count as two full units in a faculty member’s load.
Recommendation 7:
Faculty instructional load should be calculated on an annual basis; the 6 units that comprise annual load may be achieved flexibly, with (for example) 3.5 units accrued in one term and 2.5 in the other.

Recommendation 8:
Faculty should be given the opportunity (if not actively encouraged) to develop innovative “study away” courses that involve classroom meetings during the regular semester and off-campus experiences outside the regular academic calendar; faculty should have the option of counting such courses—unlike summer school—as part of regular, annual instructional load. (Such loads might be calculated as 3-2-1 or 3-2.5-.5, depending upon the structure of the course or experience.)

Recommendation 9:
Any egregious inequities in faculty load should be addressed immediately: resolving such inequities deserves priority consideration in academic planning.

Recommendation 10:
In no semester should a faculty accrue more than 4 load units (or the equivalent); it should be exceedingly rare for a faculty member to accrue 8 or more load units in any regular academic year. Untenured faculty, in particular, should not be assigned to teach overloads.

Recommendation 11:
Stetson’s overload compensation policy should be transparent and equitably applied, across the different academic divisions and disciplines. Faculty should have the option of “banking” overload units, or receiving compensation.

Recommendation 12:
In order to ensure high quality advising to students, faculty members’ advising loads should not exceed 20 students.

Recommendation 13:
The University should develop more reliable ways of measuring the non-instructional/service elements of faculty work, with particular attention to instances in which “excessive” service responsibilities prevent faculty from developing as fully as they otherwise might as scholars and creative artists. While unconvinced of the value of attempting to quantify every aspect of faculty work, we feel that fractional load credit might be provided for significant responsibilities—including advising—that exceed ordinary expectations by a significant margin.

Recommendation 14:
The University should provide opportunities for course reductions and releases not just for important service/administrative work but for significant scholarly/creative activity as well.