SMCCCD WORKLOAD COMMITTEE REPORT

SPRING 2018 WORKLOAD SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The issue of workload is regularly discussed in all institutions of higher education as the nature of work changes over time due to the development and evolution of teaching and learning practices, the use of technology, administrative responsibilities and assignments, innovation that leads to new initiatives, and strategic efforts to realize the mission and vision of the institution. With that reality comes the responsibility to engage in collegial discussion about how to manage the workload of the institution. As part of that responsibility, the SMCCCD Workload Committee was created in May 2017 as part of the AFT/District contract settlement. The Proposal for Workload Committee stated that:

> "AFT and the District recognize that faculty perform extensive duties outside of the classroom. Some of these duties are enumerated in Appendix D. The parties would like to distribute those duties among all faculty. Sometimes the distribution is not even, and one or more faculty members end up doing more than their fair share. The purpose of this committee is to develop a mechanism for distributing those duties, and when a faculty member ends up with too many, a mechanism for compensation and when a faculty member ends up with too few, a means to address that." (see Appendix A)

In support of that charge, the Workload Committee developed and conducted a survey of all full-time faculty in the SMCCCD to better understand the level of workload experienced. The results of that survey are presented in this report. Furthermore, an analysis of those results and set of recommendations are included for consideration by the AFT 1493 and the District.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKLOAD COMMITTEE

Full-time faculty who responded to the survey reported that their workload has increased overtime. The committee makes the following general recommendations. These include:

- Work collegially to identify unnecessary, unproductive, and/or inefficient activities, processes, and procedures that do not provide value and improve or eliminate them. Examples of these, based on the survey results, include:
    - Program Review content, process, and technology platform.
    - Student Learning Outcome (SLO) content, process, and technology platform.
    - Governance and committee structures and processes.
- Work to ensure that program, department, division, and/or college responsibilities are evenly distributed among full-time faculty and/or adjunct faculty, to the extent possible.

- Ensure that all adjuncts who are assigned to tasks outside of teaching, office hours, and related duties are paid for their time, as allowed by contract. Provide clear, written, guidance to that effect.
- Work to identify full-time faculty activities that can be assigned a load unit value and allow for an agreed upon load banking and expenditure procedure, including, but not limited to, professional development activities, statewide initiative leadership, hiring committees, and/or tenure review committees.
- Work to clarify the language in the contract so expectations for a full-time faculty workload are more clearly stated, in order to allow for the above.
- In order to ensure a more even distribution of the workload among faculty, we recommend that faculty who are appointed to district and college committees be appointed by the Academic Senate or AFT in accordance with Title 5 (53203).
- Examine and more clearly define faculty roles that include coordination, direction, supervision, and recruitment (program, department, sports, etc.) and provide compensation and support where appropriate.

There was a recognition by the committee that there is a need to define a reasonable workload which resulted in the following additional recommendations:

- In order to work toward establishing a reasonable workload, there should be a value placed on specific duties and responsibilities, and a maximum expected value for full-time faculty to engage in each semester. This could include, but is not limited to service on specific committees (e.g., Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, Tenure Review committees). It is recognized that any value placed on specific activities will need to be negotiated.
- Any specific definition of what constitutes a reasonable workload must also involve a change to the faculty evaluation process to accommodate progressive discipline for faculty who do not complete the required workload.

WORKLOAD COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The Workload Committee met regularly over the course of 2017-18 and 2018-19 academic years to first develop and distribute the Workload Survey, and then to review and understand the results in order to develop the set of recommendations included in this report. Recommendations of the Committee reflect the consensus of the members based on the information gathered from the survey. Although discussions involved both individual perspectives and opinions, as well as general information contributed by various constituencies, the Committee ultimately relied on the actual data provided by faculty who responded to the Workload Survey to form the recommendations.

Name	Position	Constituent Representation
Doniella Maher	Faculty, English	Cañada College – AFT
Michael Hoffman	Faculty, Mathematics	Cañada College – Senate
Leigh Anne Shaw	Faculty, ESOL	Skyline College – Senate

Nina Floro	Faculty, English	Skyline College – AFT
Anne Stafford	Faculty, English	CSM – AFT
Rosemary Nurre	Faculty, Accounting	CSM – Senate
Charlene Frontiera	Dean, Math/Science Division	District – Administration
Kathy Blackwood	Executive Vice Chancellor	District – Administration
David Feune	Director of Human Resources	District – Administration
Aaron McVean	Vice Chancellor	District – Administration

SUMMARY RESULTS

The District Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) Office sent an online survey to all N = 331 full-time faculty employed by the SMCCCD in Spring 2018, and received n = 177 responses, for a response rate of 53%. (For a complete copy of the Workload Survey see Appendix B)

RESPONDENT PROFILE

The following tables contain information describing the faculty who responded to the Workload Survey. College participation rates varied, with CSM faculty making up the largest number of respondents. However, participation was generally strong across all three Colleges.

COLLEGE AND FACULTY RESPONDENTS

Primary College	Total Full-Time Faculty	Total Respondents	Response Rate
Cañada College	79	39	49%
College of San Mateo	128	75	59%
Skyline College	124	63	51%
SMCCCD	331	177	53%

Table 1

The majority of respondents identified Instructional Faculty (n = 159, 90%) as their primary assignment, with the remaining having primarily a Non-Instructional Assignment (i.e., counselors, librarians). The response rate within each group is presented in Table 2 below.

Primary Role	Respondents	Total	Response rate
Instructional	159	275	58%
Non-Instructional	18	56	32%

Table 2

Primary Role by Campus	Instructional	Non-Instructional	N

Cañada College	90%	10%	39
College of San Mateo	92%	8%	75
Skyline College	87%	13%	63
SMCCCD	90%	10%	177

Table 3

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT

The duration of tenure in the District for the faculty who responded to the survey is presented in Table 4 below. The majority of respondents (*n* =113; 64%) indicated they had been with the District for more than 10 years, with a large percentage (*n* =81; 46%) indicating they had been with the District for more than 16 years.

How long have you been teaching in the SMCCCD?	Respondents	%
Less than one year	4	2%
1-3 years	18	10%
4-9 years	42	24%
10-15 years	32	18%
16 years or more	81	46%
Total	177	100%

Table 4

Employment Length x Campus	Cañada College	College of San Mateo	Skyline College	SMCCCD
Less than one year	0%	3%	3%	2%
1-3 years	5%	15%	8%	10%
4-9 years	33%	15%	29%	24%
10-15 years	21%	21%	13%	18%
16 years or more	41%	47%	48%	46%
SMCCCD Total	39	75	63	177

Table 5

Employment Length x Primary Instructional Role	Instructional	Non-Instructional	SMCCCD
Less than one year	2%	6%	2%
1-3 years	9%	17%	10%
4-9 years	23%	33%	24%
10-15 years	18%	17%	18%
16 years or more	48%	28%	46%
Total	159	18	177

Table 6

The current number of full-time faculty in my department is approximately	Respondents	%
1 full-time faculty	38	21%
2 full-time faculty	19	11%
3-5 full-time faculty	51	29%
6-10 full-time faculty	35	20%
11 full-time faculty or more	32	18%
I'm not sure	2	1%
Total	177	100%

Table 7

ASSESSMENT OF WORKLOAD

A central question of the Workload Survey asked full-time faculty to assess the changes they have experienced in workload overtime. Overall, a majority (n = 114; 64%) of faculty indicated that their workload has "substantially increased" since they began working in the District. An additional 25% (n = 44) indicated that their workload had moderately increased.

Since I started working in the SMCCCD, my workload has:	Respondents	%
Substantially increased	114	64%
Moderately increased	44	25%
Slightly increased	8	5%
Not increased/remained about the same	11	6%
Total	177	100%

Table 8

There was a relationship between faculty's home campus and their assessment of workload increase, with more faculty at Skyline College (75%) reporting that their workload had "substantially increased" compared to CSM (60%) and Cañada (56%).

Workload Level x Campus	Substantially increased	Moderately increased	Slightly increased	Not increased/remained about the same	N
Cañada College	56%	33%	0%	10%	39
College of San Mateo	60%	27%	5%	8%	75
Skyline College	75%	17%	6%	2%	63
SMCCCD	64%	25%	5%	6%	177

Table 9

Regardless of instructional role (i.e., Instructional vs. Non-Instructional Faculty), the majority of respondents (65% and 61%, respectively) reported that their workload had "substantially increased" since they began their employment with the District.

Workload Level x Instructional Role	Substantially increased	Moderately increased	Slightly increased	Not increased/remained about the same	N
Instructional	65%	24%	5%	6%	159
Non-Instructional	61%	33%	0%	6%	18
Total	**64%**	**25%**	**5%**	**6%**	**177**

Table 10

There was some relationship between the amount of time a respondent had been employed with the District and their assessment of workload. Faculty who have been with the District more than 16 years (75%) and between 4-9 years (67%) were the most likely to report that their workload had "substantially increased." The rate for faculty who have been with the District from 10-15 years was only slightly lower (56%).

Workload Level x Employment Length	Substantially increased	Moderately increased	Slightly increased	Not increased/remained about the same	N
Less than one year	25%	25%	50%	0%	4
1-3 years	33%	39%	6%	22%	18
4-9 years	67%	24%	5%	5%	42
10-15 years	56%	38%	0%	6%	32
16 years or more	75%	17%	4%	4%	81
Total	64%	25%	5%	6%	177

Table 11

There was a clear relationship between reported workload increase and the size of the respondent's department. Those who were the only full-time faculty in their department consistently reported that their workload had "substantially increased" (84%), with 3-5 Faculty departments having the next highest percentage who reported as such (71%). Possible reasons for this are discussed in the Conclusions at the end of this report.

Workload Level x Size of Department	Substantially increased	Moderately increased	Slightly increased	Not increased/remained about the same	N
1 full-time faculty	84%	16%	0%	0%	38
2 full-time faculty	58%	26%	5%	11%	19
3-5 full-time faculty	71%	20%	6%	4%	51

6-10 full-time faculty	43%	37%	3%	17%	35
11 full-time faculty or more	59%	28%	9%	3%	32
I'm not sure	50%	50%	0%	0%	2
Total	64%	25%	5%	6%	177

Table 12

Q6) STUDENT ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND COMMITMENTS

Faculty were asked to estimate the number of hours they spent on student engagement activities and commitments that occurred outside of regular classroom and office hours. As shown in Table 13 below, the majority (n = 112; 70%) of faculty reported that they spent between 1-199 hours on these efforts.

Range	Respondents	% of Respondents	CUMULATIVE % of Respondents	% of Total Hours	CUMULATIVE % of Total Hours		Total Hours
1100+	2	1%	100%	9%	100%		2,697
1000-1099	2	1%	99%	7%	91%		2,109
900-999	0	0%	98%	0%	85%		0
800-899	0	0%	98%	0%	85%		0
700-799	2	1%	98%	5%	85%		1,441
600-699	3	2%	97%	6%	80%		1,982
500-599	4	2%	95%	7%	74%		2,174
400-499	6	3%	93%	8%	67%		2,596
300-399	9	5%	91%	9%	58%		2,961
200-299	24	14%	86%	19%	49%		5,809
100-199	42	24%	72%	19%	30%		5,920
1-99	80	46%	48%	12%	12%		3,599
0	3	2%	2%	0%	0%		0
Total	177	100%					31,288

Table 13

Q7) DIVISION/DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND COMMITMENTS

Range	Respondents	% of Respondents	CUMULATIVE % of Respondents	% of Total Hours	CUMULATIVE % of Total Hours		Total Hours
1100+	0	0%	100%	0%	0%		0
1000-1099	1	1%	100%	3%	100%		1,070

900-999	0	0%	99%	0%	97%		0
800-899	2	1%	99%	5%	97%		1,760
700-799	6	3%	98%	12%	92%		4,446
600-699	2	1%	95%	3%	81%		1,257
500-599	3	2%	94%	4%	77%		1,539
400-499	8	5%	92%	10%	73%		3,593
300-399	18	10%	87%	17%	64%		6,287
200-299	27	16%	80%	17%	47%		6,436
100-199	58	34%	64%	22%	30%		8,420
1-99	48	28%	30%	8%	8%		2,916
0	4	2%	2%	0%	0%		0
Total	177	100%					37,724

Table 14

Q8) IF YOU WERE ON A FULL-TIME FACULTY HIRING COMMITTEE, HOW LONG, ON AVERAGE, DO YOU SPEND SCREENING EACH APPLICATION? PLEASE ENTER TIME IN INCREMENTS OF 15 MINUTES.

Based on the amount of time that faculty reported spending on application screening (see Table 15 below), an average amount of time per applicant was calculate at 0.38 hours (the mid-point of the range from .25-.50, which represented 77% of respondents). Based on the average number of applications per faculty hiring committee from the same time period referenced in the survey, the average amount of time spent screening all applications for a full-time faculty hiring committee was **16.73 hours**. This does not include screening committee work outside of application review (writing job announcements and interview questions, interviewing candidates, committee discussion, etc.) and will naturally vary depending on the number of applicants.

Range	Respondents	% of Respondents	CUMULATIVE % of Respondents	% of Total Hours	CUMULATIVE % of Total Hours		Total Hours
2.1+	6	8%	100%	55%	100%		41.25
1.751-2	0	0%	92%	0%	45%		0
1.51-1.75	0	0%	92%	0%	45%		0
1.251-1.5	1	1%	92%	2%	45%		1.5
1.1-1.25	1	1%	91%	2%	43%		1.25
.751-1.0	4	5%	90%	5%	42%		4
.51-.75	6	8%	85%	6%	36%		4.5
.25-.50	60	77%	77%	30%	30%		22.75
0	99	0%	0%	0%	0%		0
Total	177	100%					75.25

Table 15

Q9) COLLEGE OR COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES AND COMMITMENTS

Range	Respondents	% of Respondents	CUMULATIVE % of Respondents	% of Total Hours	CUMULATIVE % of Total Hours		Total Hours
100+	10	5%	100%	41%	100%		2,321
75-99	7	4%	95%	10%	59%		592
50-74	22	12%	91%	23%	49%		1,311
25-49	24	14%	79%	15%	26%		825
1-24	62	35%	65%	11%	11%		625
0	52	30%	30%	0%	0%		0
Total	177	100%					5,674

Table 16

Q10) IF YOU WERE INVOLVED IN ANY OF THE ABOVE ACTIVITIES DURING THE SUMMER 2017 TERM, ESTIMATE HOW MANY UNCOMPENSATED HOURS YOU SPENT:

Range	Respondents	% of Respondents	CUMULATIVE % of Respondents	% of Total Hours	CUMULATIVE % of Total Hours		Total Hours
200+	1	2%	100%	10%	100%		200
190-199	0	0%	98%	0%	90%		0
180-189	0	0%	98%	0%	90%		0
170-179	1	2%	98%	9%	90%		175
160-169	0	0%	96%	0%	81%		0
150-159	0	0%	96%	0%	81%		0
140-149	0	0%	96%	0%	81%		0
130-139	0	0%	96%	0%	81%		0
120-129	3	5%	96%	18%	81%		360
110-119	0	0%	91%	0%	63%		0
100-109	1	2%	91%	5%	63%		100
90-99	0	0%	89%	0%	58%		0
80-89	2	4%	89%	8%	58%		160
70-79	1	2%	85%	4%	50%		72
60-69	3	5%	84%	9%	47%		186
50-59	1	2%	78%	3%	37%		52
40-49	4	7%	76%	8%	35%		160
30-39	4	7%	69%	7%	27%		135
20-29	11	20%	62%	12%	20%		241
10-19	8	15%	42%	5%	8%		95
1-9	15	27%	27%	3%	3%		65

0	122	0%	0%	0%	0%		0
Total	177	100%					2,001

Table 17

Q6 + Q7 +Q9 STUDENT ENGAGEMENT: DEPARTMENTAL/DIVISION; AND COLLEGE/COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Range	Respondents	% of Respondents	CUMULATIVE % of Respondents	% of Total Hours	CUMULATIVE % of Total Hours		Total Hours
1100+	10	6%	100%	21%	100%		15,321
1000-1099	7	4%	94%	10%	79%		7280
900-999	2	1%	90%	3%	70%		1884
800-899	2	1%	89%	2%	67%		1709
700-799	7	4%	88%	7%	65%		5290
600-699	14	8%	84%	12%	58%		8958
500-599	11	6%	76%	8%	46%		5929
400-499	13	7%	70%	8%	38%		5876
300-399	27	15%	63%	13%	30%		9445
200-299	26	15%	47%	8%	17%		6308
100-199	37	21%	32%	7%	9%		5,477
1-99	20	11%	11%	2%	2%		1,210
0	1	0%	0%	0%	0%		0
Total	177	100%					74,686

Table 18

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Survey Item	Agree	Disagree	N
Accreditation self-study responsibilities are fairly distributed	50.6%	49.4%	164
Student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment responsibilities are fairly distributed	64.3%	35.7%	168
Academic Senate committee responsibilities are fairly distributed	64.5%	35.5%	166
Other campus committees/task forces/work teams/work group responsibilities are fairly distributed	53.0%	47.0%	164
Comprehensive program review and/or annual program review (annual program planning) responsibilities are fairly distributed	57.0%	43.0%	165
Curriculum planning responsibilities are fairly distributed	66.3%	33.7%	163

A small number of full-time faculty bear a disproportionate amount of College and Division/Department/Program workload.	71.6%	28.4%	162
When workload concerns arise, I feel comfortable discussing them with my Dean	71.9%	28.1%	171
If my workload becomes difficult to manage, faculty colleagues in my Division/Department/Program will assist me	62.7%	37.3%	169

Table 19

CALCULATION OF AVERAGE WORKLOAD

In an attempt to characterize the average workload experienced by the majority of faculty, the workload committee identified criteria for the calculation of average workload. The calculation was based on an academic year of **35 weeks**. For each set of questions, presented below, a cut off was identified such that the next higher range of hours included fewer than ten (10) additional respondents.

Q6) STUDENT ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND COMMITMENTS

Using the criteria specified above, an average workload experienced for faculty participation in student engagement activities and commitments was calculated. The average workload for these activities was **3.13 hours/week**.

Q7) DIVISION/DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND COMMITMENTS

Using the criteria specified above, an average workload experienced for faculty engaged in Division/Department/Program Development Activities and Commitments was calculated. The average workload for these activities was **4.45 hours/week.** This number *did not* include Division/Department/Program meeting attendance.

Q9) COLLEGE OR COMMUNITY RELATIONS ACTIVITIES AND COMMITMENTS

Using the criteria specified above, and average workload experienced for faculty engaged in College or Community Relations Activities and Commitments was calculated. The average workload for these activities was **0.54 hours/week**.

DIVISION, DEPARTMENT AND OTHER COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

An attempt was made to quantify the number of hours spent on committee responsibilities outside of those addressed by the Workload Survey. Each of the Colleges was asked to provide information on full-time faculty attendance at Division and Department meetings, and service on other committees such as Advisory Committees for CTE programs. Although the scheduling of Division meetings is relatively consistent, with approximately 32-36 hours of meetings scheduled each year (resulting in an addition of 1

hour/week of average workload), there is neither consistent nor sufficient attendance tracking conducted across all divisions that would allow for an accurate calculation. Even greater variability in both frequency and attendance was reported for Departmental meetings, preventing useful conclusions about the average workload experience by all full-time faculty. Additionally, service on Advisory Committees was reported by a relatively small number of full-time faculty based on service area, and therefore was also not reflective of an average workload. There is additional workload associated with these activities that was not captured by the survey.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE WORKLOAD COMMITTEE

Taken together, the average workload experienced by full-time faculty outside regular teaching responsibilities was calculated to be **9.12 hours/week**. Although there was a range of hours reported, there was a great deal of consensus among the majority of respondents around the average additional time spent on the activities outlined in the Workload Survey. This average amount is not presented as what should be expected or what is reasonable. It is merely a reflection of the experience of the majority of faculty across the District. Furthermore, this number does not capture the committee, task force, work team, or other similar work that a number of faculty engage in. Due to the significantly greater variability reported, as outlined above, these activities were not included in the "average workload" calculation. Participation in Division meetings was included at an average of one hour per week.

Service on full-time faculty hiring committees was calculated as a separate workload experience because of the variability in hiring, by department and year, and the recognition that not all faculty serve on hiring committees. As outlined previously, the average amount of time spent screening applications for a full-time faculty hiring committee was 16.73 hours/applicant. It was recognized that faculty from the department that is hiring a new position want to be involved in that process. It was also recognized that if service on hiring committees becomes a consideration in a reasonable workload, there can be limitations placed on who can serve on how many hiring committees by responsible administrators.