

We're Working on the Faculty Work Load

By STEVE SHINN

**In 1957 the cry was to
keep up with the Russians.**

**The public was ready
to give higher education
whatever it wanted.**

**"Honest faculty will
admit that some . . . research
was worthless."**

**You don't measure a
lawyer's work by the
time spent in court.**

**One researcher counted
25 workload components.**

**The University of Missouri
has kept track of instructional
costs since 1965.**

Sputnik may be at the root of the problem. Russia launched a satellite in 1957; America nervously looked for ways to catch up and chose the university as its vehicle for doing so. Enrollments soared as getting-a-college-education very nearly became a patriotic duty. Research grants blossomed from every federal agency and private foundation. Faculty, especially PhDs, were in great demand, and some even were enticed to certain campuses with the promise of light teaching loads.

That seemed to be what the public wanted, and higher education, being accountable (remember that term, folks) to the public, responded. It was the Golden Sixties—an era when the American people happily fed higher education's seemingly insatiable appetite for money.

But, then, disenchantment set in. The public heard about six and seven-hour teaching loads, believed that professors were more interested in research than teaching, and called a halt. The feeling is widespread, says one university president, that the faculty has "become a protected featherbedding elite." And Dr. A. G. Unklesbay, MU's administrative vice president, says, "Any honest faculty member will admit that some of what was passed off as research was worthless."

Much of the research is valuable, of course, and part of the public's problem is simply a misunderstanding of what constitutes faculty workload. Although some states—notably Michigan and Texas—have legislated loads of 12 hours in a classroom per week, workload means more. After all, you wouldn't measure a lawyer's workload by the time he spends in a courtroom, or a salesman's by the time he spends in a customer's office.

One researcher identified 25 components of faculty workload: (1) lower division teaching; (2) upper division teaching; (3) graduate teaching; (4) laboratory teaching; (5) seminar teaching; (6) classes of over 40 students; (7) designing correspondence courses; (8) teaching correspondence courses; (9) advising students; (10) directing master's theses; (11) directing doctoral dissertations; (12) membership on dissertation or thesis committees; (13) sponsoring student organizations; (14) membership on university committees; (15) chairing university committees; (16) chairing academic departments; (17) supervising employees; (18) holding major offices in regional or national professional organizations; (19) research activities; (20) publishing; (21) university-connected travel; (22) university-connected consulting; (23) public relations activities; (24) writing speeches for outside groups; and (25) attending required meetings.

Since 1965, the University of Missouri has kept similar—although not so extensive data—on all teaching faculty as a method of pinpointing the cost of its direct instructional activities. This year a new form, Faculty Activity Survey, is being used. Reproduced on the following pages, the form will make possible standard data that can be compared with data from other universities

Such data may also be used to review distribution of faculty effort.

across the country. The hope is that the University can utilize such data not only to pinpoint the cost of various faculty activities for both internal and external groups (such as the General Assembly), but also to review the comparative effort devoted by faculty to teaching, research, service, and other workload components.

There are some limitations. An obvious one is that each faculty member fills out the form himself, and it is unlikely that anyone will think small. The forms are reviewed by the department chairmen and deans, however. There is some froth inherent in the form, too. For example, the instructions for completing the blanks under "Unscheduled Teaching" include the suggestion, "Discussion with colleagues about teaching." This, of course could be nothing more than a bull session at a coffee break in Jesse Hall or a 5 p.m. martini interlude in the neighborhood bar. There is no doubt, however, that the 50 hours or so turned in by most faculty members are a more accurate assessment of their work week than a "teaching load" of 8-12 hours.

How does directing a thesis compare with teaching freshman English?

The trick in all of this is to establish equivalencies, that is to determine how directing a thesis compares to teaching a beginning course in freshman English. What's directing a lab worth as compared to chairing a committee? And which lab and which committee? A University-wide ad hoc committee with Unklesbay as chairman is now looking into all this. Called the Faculty Effort Committee (some member objected to the term, workload), the group hopes to have some recommendations ready by the end of this school year.

Universities throughout the nation are trying to apply management techniques.

Universities throughout the United States are working on this kind of problem—trying to apply some of the computerized management techniques of industry to higher education. It's what the public seems to want, and higher education, as always, is accountable and responsive to the public—although not as rapidly as some would like. This new attempt at accountability, which seeks to quantify faculty effort, could result in a valuable tool for college administrators. The data should enable them to better establish educational goals and to better assess the results. The Columbia Campus's College of Engineering already has used this approach successfully.

But in the final analysis, each faculty member must be accountable to himself.

Yet, there is danger here, too. In attempting to quantify workload, it's easy to jump to the conclusion that only the measurable matters. But good teaching can't be obtained from a computer printout. The exciting and the dull, the conscientious and the goof-off will have the same number of points. The Campus's 112 department chairmen can be a big help here, and MU has moved to make them more accountable for what goes on in their disciplines by making plans to give the chairmen 12-month rather than nine-month contracts and paying them extra for their work as administrators. But the real hope for quality is in the direct charge of the faculty, and each teacher, in the final analysis, must be accountable to himself. □

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
FACULTY ACTIVITY SURVEY

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

Instruction and Departmental Research

NAME	TITLE
DIVISION	DEPARTMENT
ENGINEERING	ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

FISCAL REFERENCE BLOCK

Ref. Col.	F. T. E.	Activity	Account Name	Number	Semester Salary
A	.50	I & DR	Electrical Engineering S&W	2504-1100	\$4,500.00
E	.20	Extension	Engineering Extension S&W	3799-1100	1,800.00
D	.10	Sep. Budgeted Research	Engineering Research Ctr S&W	2805-1100	900.00
K	.10	Sponsored Research	NSF#2169H	2102-2228	900.00
K	.10	Sponsored Research	NASA#26-114-015 8/74 Brown	2115-2228	900.00
1.00					Total Semester Salary \$9,000.00

Fiscal Reference Column links activities to funding. "A" represents state funds and student fees; "K" is grant money in this case from the federal government.

SECTION A: TEACHING ACTIVITIES

A.1 Scheduled Teaching

Line No.	Curricular Designation	Course Number	Credit Hours	SECTION IDENTIFICATION			Enrollment	CODE R = Remedial E = Extension	(g) Formal Contact Hours	(h) Other Contact Hours	(i) Preparation and Admin. Hours	(j) Avg. Hour per Week	(k)	
				Type	Days - Time	Room								Bldg.
1	EL ENG	324	3.0	NL	TTH 6:00-7:30	110	Engr	18	E	3	2	5	E	
6	EL ENG	25	3.0	NL	MWF 10:40	12	Engr	28		3	1	1	5	A
7	EL ENG	25	3.0	NL	MWF 1:40	12	Engr	26		3	1	1	5	A
Non-Credit Instruction														
Activity Description								(l)						
Seminar on Electrical Circuits for Contractors								M	26	2	1	1	4	E
Subtotal A.1 Scheduled Teaching									11	3	5	19		
A.2 Unscheduled Teaching (includes instruction through correspondence and mass media)														
Activity Description										(l) Level	(m) Type			
Thesis Committee										D		1	A	
Grading Exams in Correspondence Studies										L	C	2	E	
Energy Conservation Radio Special										S	M	1	E	

Actual time spent in class

A non-credit extension seminar for college graduates (master's level).

*D = doctoral
L = freshmen and sophomores
S = sub-collegiate (this is a non-credit course taught over the radio.)*

Column "K" is completed by the department chairman and, therefore, can act as a check on the accuracy of the total report.

*Complete column (m) for Extension administered activities only.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
FACULTY ACTIVITY SURVEY

Giving advice to students about their schedules and academic programs.

This also includes preparing for a new course to be taught in the future.

Keeping up in your field.

Also could include meeting with parents, attending student recitals, etc.

Generally, working with faculty of another department or division.

Consulting work would go here, including any for which the faculty member receives fees from outside the University.

The average workweek reported by this particular faculty member.

SECTION A CONTINUED	Activity Description	(j) Level	(m) Type	(i) Avg. Hrs. per Week	(k) Grade
A.3 Academic Program Advising	New Freshman Advising	L		0.5	A
A.4 Course and Curriculum Research and Development	Preparing Material for Forthcoming Workshop	M	G	0.5	E
Subtotal A.2, A.3, and A.4				5	
SECTION B: Research, Scholarship & Creative Work Activities					(n) Code E-Extension
B.1 Specific Projects	NSF Grant #2169H Cost Sharing Grant NSF Grant #2169H Univ. Administrative Duties in Grant NASA-#26-114-015 8174 Brown			5	K
				5	A
				5	K
B.2 General Scholarship and Professional Development	Reading Articles & Books Attending Professional Meetings			3.5	A
				0.5	A
Subtotal Section B				19	
Section C: Internal Service Activities					(n) Code E-Extension
C.1 Student Oriented Service	Sponsoring Engineering Club Preparing Recommendations			0.5	A
				0.5	A
		Code Level			
C.2 Administrative Duties	1 Admin. Engr. Extension Center 1 Admin. Duties-Engr. Res. Ctr		E	1	E
				5	D
C.3 Committee Participation	1 Department Meetings			1	A
C.4 General Professional Service/Advice Directed Inside the Institution	Consulting with Medical Faculty on the Circuit Design of Kidney Machine			1	A
Subtotal Section C				9	
SECTION D: External Service Activities					(n) Code E-Extension
General Professional Service/Advice Directed Outside the Institution					
Subtotal Section D					
SIGNATURE		TOTAL AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK			52
(INDIVIDUAL COMPLETING REPORT)		(DATE)			