![San José State University logo]

San José State
U N I V E R S I T Y

A campus of The California State University

Office of the Academic Senate • One Washington Square • San Jose, California 95192-0024 • 408-924-2440 • Fax: 408-924-2451

SS-S02-6

At its meeting of May 13, 2002 the SJSU Academic Senate passed the following Sense of the Senate Resolution presented by Ken Peter for the AIM Task Force.

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION
ENDORSING THE ATTACHED REPORT: ALLEVIATING FACULTY WORKLOAD AT SJSU

Whereas, WASC, in its last (1994) reaccreditation of SJSU called attention to the problem of faculty "overload" and urged that SJSU develop a "systematic plan" for dealing with it before it "further erodes morale, restrains good teaching, or provokes antagonism between the administration and faculty"; and

Whereas, SJSU has not before now developed the systematic plan called for by our accreditation agency; and

Whereas, The Senate, in SM-F01-1, as amended by SM-F01-3, created the AIM Task Force and charged it to submit long-term recommendations to the Senate for the purpose of developing "a model depicting what faculty workload should look like in 2007, create a plan for achieving this model over time, and develop benchmarks for identifying progress toward this model"; and

Whereas, The attached report fulfills this charge; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate SJSU endorses the attached report "Alleviating Faculty Workload at SJSU;" be it further

Resolved, That the Senate declares that implementation of the attached report should be the University's highest priority over the next five years, and will proceed to charge its various committees to undertake the tasks asked of them in the report to fully implement its recommendations; be it further

Resolved, That the Academic Senate SJSU   urges the administration of SJSU to declare its
          support for the attached report, to work closely with the Senate to implement its
          recommendations, and to apply all of its ingenuity and leadership to reach a successful
          solution to the problem of faculty workload at SJSU.

Recommended by the AIM Task Force April 30 11-0-0. Not present: 3.

Present: Peter, Hamill, Shaw, Spano, Gorman, Nance, Morris, Rickford, Pour, Conrath, Highby.

*Financial Impact: Rising from approximately $1 million the first year ($750,000 is already in base) to
approximately $10 million (in 2002 dollars) over five to ten years.*

Alleviating Faculty Workload   at San Jose State University

Report from the Academic Innovation Model Task Force
to the Academic Senate of SJSU

Draft 10.0 (Prepared for Final Senate Reading)
May 6, 2002

Aim Task Force Membership:

David Conrath, Dean, College of Business
Robert Cooper, Associate Dean, College of Social Science
Michael Gorman, College of Social Work
Patrick Hamill, College of Science, Senate
Marie Highby, Lecturers, College of Science
Teresa Morris, Library
Bill Nance, Office of the Provost, Co Chair AIM
Kenneth Peter, Senate, College of Social Science, Co Chair AIM
Gilda Pour, Senate, College of Engineering
Angela Rickford, Senate, College of Education
Inger Sagatun-Edwards, Chair of Administration of Justice, CASA
Bill Shaw, Chair of Philosophy, College of Humanities and the Arts
Carmen Sigler, Dean, College of the Humanities and the Arts, Senate
Shawn Spano, College of Social Science

Advisors:

Sandy Dewitz, AVP Institutional Planning and Research
Patricia Hill, President, SJSU Chapter, California Faculty Association
Peter Lee, AVP Faculty Affairs

"To promote the highest-quality academic environment possible in all disciplines throughout San José State University by fostering academic innovation among faculty and the work in which they are involved. After consulting broadly, including with students, and working within the framework of Senate documents on appointment, rank and tenure, and the MOU, and based on established principles of faculty development, including but not limited to Boyer's model, the task force will strive to nurture an appropriate mix of the various types of faculty work that result (e.g., the Teacher-Scholar, the Scholar-Teacher, the Service-Teacher, etc.) The task force should begin with the premise that successful academic innovation depends in large measure upon investment of resources in faculty so that faculty can direct a portion of their time and energy toward innovations in teaching, scholarship, and service."

--from the charge of AIM, SM-F01-2:

"The Team found virtually unanimous agreement among SJSU administrators and faculty that workloads have increased, resources have diminished, and that coping with overload is the immediate challenge…. SJSU should remember that neither the heroic efforts of its faculty to cope with overload, nor the remedial efforts of departments and the Office of Faculty Affairs constitute a solution. The Team heard administrators and faculty speak of the need to rethink faculty roles and functions and to change the rules, but did not see evidence that a systematic effort to do so was even contemplated…. While it is understood that budget realities greatly influence this issue, it will benefit SJSU to move where it can from recognition to action before faculty overload further erodes morale, restrains good teaching, or provokes antagonism between the administration and faculty."

--WASC Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, San Jose State University Report, November 1994, pp. 40-42).

Alleviating Faculty Workload   at San Jose State University

Report from the Academic Innovation Model Task Force
to the Academic Senate of SJSU

The problem of faculty workload at SJSU

The problem of faculty workload at San Jose State University can be explained best in historical perspective. Faculty do very different work and fulfill vastly different expectations in 2002 than they did in 1961 when the California State College system was founded, and yet the University has been unable to change sufficiently in the fiscal, policy, bureaucratic, and even cultural arenas to adequately support the new realities of faculty workload. Faculty today are subject to a resource allocation scheme that makes unrealistic assumptions of them. Workload is currently allocated primarily on the basis of benchmarks that are quantitative and institutional, rather than qualitative and individual. As a result, the current scheme fails to promote several key values, such as the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service; it also fails to establish equity in workload distribution.   The failure of the current workload system places faculty at risk of providing diminished quality in all the areas in which they work. Therefore, the AIM Task Force believes that workload should be "reworked" on the two themes of quality and equity.

> *…the current scheme fails to promote several key values, such as the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service; it also fails to establish equity in workload distribution.*

Problems with the "FTES economy"

Until a few years ago, faculty workload was allocated on the basis of a system of "Weighted Teaching Units" (WTUs).   Under the old model, tenure/tenure track (t/tt) faculty were required to teach 12 WTUs, most commonly (though never universally) in the form of 4 three-unit classes, and to do academic advising and minor committee work for an additional 3 WTUs, since this work was thought to be equivalent to one additional three-unit class. Altogether, the workload of a faculty member was said to be equal to 15 WTUs. The WTU system was a failure on numerous fronts, a fact recognized by most when it was officially removed from the contract (MOU.) Devoting much attention to it might therefore seem pointless–the proverbial beating of a dead horse. However, campuses still receive their budget allocations from the system based upon assumptions imbedded in the 15 WTU model even though they are free to depart from the model in implementation. This has made possible the creation of an alternate economy of workload distribution based upon Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES).

To simplify, campuses are funded by the system based upon their student/faculty ratio (S/F R), currently set at about 19:1. The "19" represents full time equivalent students, and the "1" represents full time equivalent faculty. Thus, the system runs on the assumption that each faculty member must teach an average of 95 students (5 x 19) each semester. However, the

formula makes no special allowance for the fact that tenure/tenure track faculty (t/tt) traditionally teach less than 15 units, or that any part of their workload is concerned with anything other than teaching quantities of students. S/F R is the exclusive source of funding, and yet it fails to account for workload associated with research, service, or mode or level of instruction. This particular formula, therefore, grants SJSU no additional funds for the quality of teaching we do, no additional funds for graduate teaching as opposed to undergraduate teaching, no additional funds for scholarly endeavors, no additional funds for community or academic service, no additional funds for anything other than the sheer numbers of students put through the system.

Under the "FTES economy," as it is becoming known, campuses are left on their own to decide how to stretch their faculty to cover their unrealistic S/F Rs. All do so by setting quotas (sometimes called "targets") for how many students (FTES) the various academic units must teach. Those academic units that consistently teach more than their quota receive more faculty and those that consistently teach less lose faculty.

> *The CSU has thus turned the finance of teaching into a quota-driven machine, with very negative consequences for faculty workload as well as for the quality of instruction.*

Academic units–departments, schools, and colleges–attempt to meet their quotas though a variety of strategies, many of which contain undesirable trade-offs for the quality of education as well as equity in workload distribution. Libraries suffer a similar dilemma as they stretch the library faculty to cover unrealistic librarian/student ratios. The FTES economy is based upon only one part of faculty work and yet is expected to pay for nearly all parts of faculty work, which produces significant workload distortions.

The CSU has thus turned the finance of teaching into a quota-driven machine, with very negative consequences for faculty workload as well as for the quality of instruction. Not everything about the shift to an FTES economy is negative, however. It has created a certain degree of freedom for the academic units, which now have the latitude to meet their quotas in ways that would not have been permitted under the WTU system. For example, across the CSU and within SJSU, some units have chosen to reduce the number of classes their faculty teach but increase, on average, the number of students in each class. Without passing judgment on the desirability of these strategies, we can note that they do represent flexibility that was not present under the WTU system.

Problems with the WTU system

The WTU system, like the FTES economy, was seriously defective. First, it failed to achieve an equitable distribution of workload across the faculty. Factors such as the mode and level of instruction, for example, or the number of students in a class, or the number of differing preparations by a faculty member, could make a huge disparity in the real workload of two faculty members each fulfilling the 15 WTU requirement. A faculty member teaching 4 different courses of 40 graduate students each is clearly more burdened than a faculty member teaching 4 identical sections of 20 undergraduates each, and yet the WTUs appear the same. Therefore, it was necessary to *weight* the different modes and levels of instruction differently.

The task of assigning weights to classes was accomplished though a mandated scheme commonly known as "C-factors" (classroom factors), but no funds were ever made available to implement the system. For a period of years C-factors fell into disuse, leaving programs with no incentive to keep the classification of their courses current. Recently the University has revived the use of C-factors for some purposes of internal resource distribution, but it is probable that many of our existing courses are no longer appropriately classified.

The WTU system's greatest failure, however, was the complete omission of scholarship from faculty workload. It made zero allowance for scholarly endeavors because scholarly endeavors were either a small or nonexistent part of the work of many faculty when the ancestors to the WTU system were invented. Over the last 40 years an expectation that faculty should engage in scholarly endeavors has grown

> *…given that the university inflicts serious professional consequences on faculty who fail at scholarship, it is simply unfair that scholarship still has no identifiable place in the faculty workload*

and has become part of system and university policy. Yet there was no corresponding change in the way that faculty workload was allocated. Scholarship was simply "extra work" done on top of the WTU model. If scholarship were primarily an optional activity, then the old WTU model would be more defensible. But given that the university inflicts serious professional consequences on faculty who fail at scholarship, it is simply unfair that scholarship still has no identifiable place in the faculty workload.

Almost as serious as the complete omission of scholarship in the WTU system is that the system failed to take account of the increase in workload associated with a more complex student body. When the California State College system began in 1961, our students were graduates of a public school system that consistently ranked first among all the states, by many measures, and provided students with consistent foundations on which college faculty could build. Today's SJSU students are far more diverse. They are graduates of a neglected public school system that provides inconsistent preparation for college. A high

> *…the system failed to take account of the increase in workload associated with a more complex student body.*

percentage speak English as a second language, and need help across the curriculum in order to improve their communication skills. This great diversity presents faculty with much greater teaching challenges than ever before. Faculty meet these challenges by working harder— instruction is now much more individualized and labor intensive. Faculty must spend great energy helping students with basic skills such as writing, information competence, and providing background information that would have been assumed in 1961. As just one example, our general education courses today require extensive and labor-intensive writing components across the curriculum. Furthermore, the workplace has become far more technical today than it was forty years ago. This has forced many academic disciplines, particularly in professional and applied fields, to struggle to keep current with the constant changes in the workplace.

Finally, the WTU system neglected to account for many service activities. It is true that it allowed 3 of the 15 WTUs to cover advising and service, so this neglect was not as profound as the neglect of scholarship. However, both community service and institutional

> *From the standpoint of faculty, accountability means more work….When these new requirements were added, nothing was subtracted….*

service have dramatically grown in importance within faculty workload over the last two generations. The increasing demands for faculty service are in direct response to broad social changes as well as to the increasing bureaucratization of the CSU. In terms of institutional service, the CSU has placed a growing emphasis upon "accountability." From the standpoint of faculty, accountability means more work. Over the last ten years faculty merit evaluations have been added, additional assessment of curriculum has been added, post-tenure review has been added, and all of these developments demand that individual faculty prepare documents and that faculty serve on new committees to judge them. When these new requirements were added, nothing was subtracted– the old assessment paradigm of providing students with individualized evaluations and grades did not simply go away when a new assessment paradigm was added on top of it. This is work created for faculty by the system, and yet the 12+3 WTU system does not provide for this extra work.

How could we establish whether our existing workload is reasonable?

Most efforts to determine an appropriate workload are based upon comparisons, which can be longitudinal (across time) or latitudinal (across space.) Comparisons can never address the ultimate issues, since they can only speak to relative conditions and not to clear standards of quality. Nevertheless, faculty themselves make comparisons between their own work and the work that colleagues in the same disciplines do at other universities, and between their own work and the work that colleagues did in previous generations at SJSU. These comparisons may give us some inspiration in conceptualizing alternative models of workload distribution.

4

Historical perspective. Both the old WTU system and the newer FTES economy are seriously defective. The FTES paradigm, however, is an institutional approach based upon the allocation of budget, and therefore bears little relation to what individual faculty do. The old WTU system, by contrast, does establish a traditional and historical baseline for workload. Leaving aside, for the time being, all of the equity issues and idiosyncrasies of the WTU paradigm, one can still describe the work of a faculty member using its vocabulary.

Scholarship greatly increased its importance in the professional development of faculty at SJSU during the Bunzel Presidency (1970-1978.) The growing importance of scholarship in this era can be seen in the evolution of the SJSU RTP policy, which has become increasingly elaborate in its discussion of scholarship. The 1964 RTP policy, for example, lists scholarship as but one of four criteria, and the criteria which merits the second smallest description at just a few sentences.[1] SJSU's current RTP policy, by contrast has but two general criteria and devotes many paragraphs to the category of "Scholarly or Artistic or Professional Achievement," noting that these contributions "are normally expected for continuation and advancement in the

---

[1] F64-5.

university."[2] But while the role of scholarship at SJSU has increased since the 1960s, the same era has seen no appreciable decrease in teaching load—in fact, the ratios of students to faculty have continually edged higher throughout the system -- a situation that has persisted to this day.[3]

> *But while the role of scholarship at SJSU has increased since the 1960s, the same era has seen no appreciable decrease in teaching load—in fact, the ratios of students to faculty have continually edged higher....*

The system underwent a similar evolution in the importance of scholarship. It was not until the 1980s that scholarship acquired an official role in the CSU. "The Master Plan left ambiguous the state's commitment to support research at CSU"[4] and the California Education Code was not amended until the late 1980s to guarantee an explicit role for research in the CSU:

> …research, scholarship, and creative activity in support of its undergraduate and graduate instructional mission is authorized in the California State University and shall be supported by the state.[5]

In the pre-Bunzel era the distribution of work would (for the most typical colleges) be something like this:

1. Four three-unit courses of about 30 students each. Typically, two of these would be identical preparations of an introductory lower-division course that was repeated by the faculty member every semester. The other two would be upper-division courses in the major or a graduate seminar.

2. Advising and limited committee service on department and school committees. Later in one's career, one might engage in more university-wide service, or chair a department, etc.

3. Limited scholarly expectations, with some variance depending upon local department norms.

The AIM Task Force cites this classic workload distribution not to endorse its particulars—in fact, we do not wish to return to this model—but to point out what a reasonable total amount of work would be. We acknowledge that the classic model is in need of modification to account for all the factors already listed above—the lack of a place for scholarship, the lack of accounting for new teaching and service demands, the lack of establishment of equity in workload allocation. But as far as determining what a reasonable amount of work would be, this seems to us to be an appropriate baseline grounded in history.

When our modern workload is compared with the historical model cited above, we cannot help but realize that current expectations are unrealistic. Faculty currently fulfill everything that was required of them in 1961 and many new responsibilities that

> *Faculty time is not infinitely elastic–it cannot stretch to continually absorb new and higher expectations without eventually endangering the quality of work.*

[2] S97-9 Appointment, Retention, Tenure And Promotion Employees.
[3] The California State University at the Beginning of the 21 Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California. http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/csu_21stcentury.pdf.
[4] Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, *The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education*, Sacramento, 1987.
[5] 66010.4 California Education Code.

have been added over the years. It is unrealistic to suggest we can solve our problems simply by working ***more--***we need to work differently today than previous generations. Faculty time is not infinitely elastic–it cannot stretch to continually absorb new and higher expectations without eventually endangering the quality of work. Faculty generally hold extremely high standards for themselves, and so when unreasonable quantities of work endangers the quality of what they do, they experience frustration and loss of morale that can compound the problem.

      Workload Surveys. In February the results of a major CSU system study on faculty workload were released.[6] In the view of the AIM Task Force it is unfortunate that the data do not go much further back, since it is likely that by 1990 the currently unreasonable patterns were already firmly ensconced. However, according to the study, faculty in the CSU have added to their workload since a similar study was conducted in 1990. The greatest increase in workload has been in the growth of time devoted to research, which grew from 6.63 weekly hours on average in 1990 to 10.21 weekly hours on average in 2001. As increasing numbers of faculty retire and are replaced by junior faculty on the tenure track, that number can be expected to grow even higher. During the same time the number of hours devoted to teaching has remained constant or even increased slightly, from 25.11 to 25.87. Faculty also report devoting more time to administrative duties, increasing from 1.41 to 2.46 hours. Perhaps in response to workload pressures elsewhere in their schedules, such as rising commute times, faculty have cut back on university and community service activities, which fell from 5.56 hours to 5.18 hours, and on student advising which fell from 5.19 to 4.43. These cuts may have negative consequences of their own, but they still leave faculty working an average of 50.23 hours a week, up from 48.51 in 1990.[7]

      One of the most troubling findings of the report, however, was that SJSU lags far behind comparable campuses in the CSU in providing faculty with assigned time. Assigned time is the administrative term for tracking when faculty are assigned to a task other than teaching 12 units of courses. In the CSU, 53% of t/tt faculty report receiving at least some assigned time, with SJSU reporting 55%. Unfortunately, SJSU compares unfavorably with campuses of similar size: Northridge reports 59%, Long Beach 60%, Fullerton 63%, San Francisco 68%, and San Diego 77%. For SJSU to grant assigned time at the average level of these comparable CSU campuses (65.4%) it would have to increase its current pool of assigned time by at least 19%. While this survey data needs to be treated with caution for two reasons (a low N for campus-based results, and faculty self-reporting rather than hard data on assigned time), it is a pattern that has held constant over 10 years--SJSU lagged behind these institutions in 1990 as well as more recently. However, the strategies used by high assigned-time campuses are varied and may

> ***For SJSU to grant assigned time at the average level of these comparable CSU campuses (65.4%) it would have to increase its pool of assigned time by at least 19%.***

not always be strategies that SJSU would wish to emulate. Several of the campuses have high

---

[6] A similar CSU study of the workload of library faculty has not been conducted. However, the Librarian/Student ratios (1.24 per 1000 FTES) is lower than San Francisco State (1.43) and San Diego State (1.30) and much lower than comparable institutions such as the SUNY system (2.50-2.60). It ranks in the bottom quartile of all master's institutions (TableN 13C, US Dept of Education CES IPEDS Academic Library Survey, using Fall 1997 enrollment data.) Furthermore, the SJSU ratios have fallen from 1.59 in 1988/89 to 1.24 in 2000/01.

[7] (CSU Faculty Workload Report; SBRI, http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/CSU_FacWrkldRpt.pdf, see table 8.)

S/F Rs, which they may achieve by carrying fewer graduate and professional programs. San Diego has a comparable S/F R (San Diego: 17.75, SJSU: 17.61)[8] and achieves the highest rate of assigned time in the system by reducing the number of classes and inflating class sizes. The AIM Task Force finds these strategies, at best, to be insufficient to achieve workload alleviation.

Accreditation Reports. In WASC's analysis of the SJSU "overload" problem, it called special attention to the effect overload had on attracting and retaining young faculty, especially faculty from under-represented populations. Since 1994 this challenge has become even more acute, as skyrocketing housing costs and rising commute times have created even greater challenges for our recruitment efforts. This year (AY 2001-2) more than 100 searches are underway, and swelling enrollments and anticipated retirements will require that recruitment and mentoring of junior faculty continues to be one of the most significant items on the SJSU agenda. WASC noted the frustration of young SJSU faculty who were told to "do everything" and asked "[w]ithin CSU guidelines, can the teaching load of probationary faculty be reduced?"[9] The 1994 WASC report is critical of the (then) existing overload and prophetic of what was to come if no substantial reform were initiated. We urge that every SJSU citizen read the excerpt placed in the beginning of this report. The AIM Task Force emphatically agrees with WASC that the best way to attract and retain an excellent faculty is through a "systematic" plan

> *The AIM Task Force emphatically agrees with WASC that the best way to attract and retain an excellent faculty is through a "systematic" plan for workload alleviation…*

for workload alleviation, so that prospective faculty can look forward to realistic work loads throughout the duration of their careers.

Other factors influencing the faculty workload problem

The AIM Task Force has not chosen to propose a recommendation on the campus's sometimes difficult working conditions, although we recognize that they contribute to workload in numerous ways. We believe that this should be the focus of another major campus effort because the Task Force lacks the expertise or time to properly give this subject its due. The Task

---

[8] CSU Statistical Abstract 1999-2000.

[9] WASC, SJSU Report, 1994, pp. 41-42.

Force received complaints about working conditions, however, that seem reasonable and serious. To the extent to which some measures are being taken to address specific problems, such as current efforts to build more faculty offices, we applaud them. Opportunities may also arise after the new library opens to utilize portions of a renovated Clark building for faculty. We also hope that the general alleviation of workload proposed in our own report will help faculty cope with the daily miseries inflicted by their working environment. We would encourage the Senate to consider initiating a comprehensive review of faculty and staff working conditions.

Another major contributor to faculty workload is the extremely high cost of housing in the area. When combined with inadequate pay, faculty find themselves unable to afford to buy or in some cases rent housing near campus, and live further and further away—Livermore, Pleasanton, Davis, Oakland, Roseville, Gilroy, Hollister, Santa Cruz, etc. The state workload survey failed to account for the time faculty consume in their commute, which is likely one of the most significant additional drains on faculty time in recent years. As faculty live further and further away from campus, they are increasingly less available for daily service activities and student advising, putting a larger burden on those who remain. Fewer and fewer young faculty, for example, are willing to serve as department chairs since this activity demands constant presence on campus. Committees cannot always manage quorums when the faculty is bifurcated into Monday-Wednesday and Tuesday-Thursday halves. As with working conditions, the AIM Task Force was overwhelmed at the prospect of taking on this gigantic but significant problem for faculty workload. We suspect that it will not be solved without statewide reform that allows for regional housing allowances. Nevertheless, the gap between pay and housing may constitute the biggest threat to the future of the faculty at SJSU.

The AIM Task Force also heard from several sources about the unusual service burden experienced by small and shrinking departments. Small departments, for example, are among the most heavily vested in the General Education program, and it is on them that much of the burden of GE Assessment has fallen. While more hands make for lighter work, fewer hands make for heavy burdens, sometimes dreadfully heavy burdens. Furthermore, small departments have inadequate assigned time for full-time Chairs, leaving part time Chairs to manage bureaucratic mandates that fall as heavily on them as they do on much larger units. The AIM Task Force acknowledges this very real problem but declines to suggest organizational changes to fix it. As serious as workload problems are for small departments, their autonomy is valuable, and so the University should not seek to alleviate small departments by extinguishing them. However, we would encourage small departments to collaborate with the University and other departments to create mechanisms by which service burdens could be shared. Perhaps, for example, college and university committees should not always be staffed on the basis of "federalism," with every department or every college represented on every committee. Overall, we hope that the reforms we suggest in Recommendation 6 will be especially helpful to Chairs and small departments.

The AIM Task Force also received suggestions that academic support staff need to be adequate to support faculty work. Too low a level of academic support forces faculty to work inefficiently at tasks that others could do better. The Task Force declines to produce a specific recommendation regarding support staff, but does believe that adequate support is important. If our suggestions regarding enrollment growth funds are implemented, support staff would receive a fair increase to accommodate increasing enrollments. At the same time, the Task Force applauds the current administration of SJSU for containing its management costs relative to other

campuses in the CSU, and urges that it continue to show great restraint in hiring MPP positions.

Such restraint in "high level" hiring is important to be able to conserve resources for staff support of faculty at the department level.

Although the recommendations by the AIM Task Force focus primarily on providing t/tt faculty with greater resources for workload innovation, we acknowledge the need to improve the situation of our non t/tt faculty as well. So-called "temporary" faculty, some with greater seniority than "permanent" faculty, teach a large portion of the classes offered on campus. We must all be concerned about the workload burdens faced by these colleagues and its relation to the quality of instruction. The Task Force is hopeful that our recommendations concerning the provision of student assistants and the establishment of equity guidelines will prove helpful to all faculty on campus, regardless of status, but at the same time acknowledge that longer term, post-AIM reforms will be needed to achieve a reasonable workload for all of our faculty.

AIM Task Force Recommendations:

Recommendation 1. The Equitable Nine-Unit Model.

By AY 2007-2008, SJSU should provide sufficient resources to the Colleges to enable them to reduce teaching workload for t/tt faculty to an average of nine units or fewer per semester, by funding a reduction in the student/faculty ratios within the colleges. Non-traditional academic units should receive equivalent workload relief.

This adjustment is necessary in response to the ever increasing research and service expectations that the university has of faculty, and the greater complexity in delivering instruction to our challenging and diverse student population. Two thirds of CSU faculty believe that insufficient resources are provided for "success" and for "professional development," sixty percent believes that current research expectations are unrealistic, a majority believes teaching expectations are unrealistic, and a majority also believes that current service expectations are unrealistic.[10] Faculty perceptions simply reflect the reality that faculty are expected to do more research and service with no appreciable decrease in teaching. We believe that academic innovation can be sustained at SJSU only if faculty are freed from some of their existing responsibilities so that they can devote time and energy to research, academic reform, improvement of teaching, governance, etc. The nine-unit model is designed to move SJSU in that direction.

TheTask Force recognizes that a nine-unit model is not appropriate for every program and every faculty member (for example, studio instructors, library faculty, and programs that have already achieved nine-unit loads by expanding class sizes) and that some colleges, schools, departments, and programs will have to determine what constitutes equivalent workload reduction for them. The strategy proposed here of gradually reducing the S/F R while leaving FTES targets constant will make it possible for these units to achieve workload alleviation equivalent to the nine-unit model in their own way. Recommendations 3 and 4, later in this report, also support this goal. Nevertheless, the norm for the vast majority of faculty should be understood to be 3 courses or nine units. This is not an unrealistic goal given that the University already provides approximately 75 FTEF worth of assigned time – the equivalent of 375 sections per semester – for a regular faculty of approximately 675.

Financially, the fairest and most workable way for the University to support this proposal is by gradually reducing the S/F R[11], while leaving FTES targets the same. (Thus, as an example, if the FTES target is 100, a SFR of 20 generates 5 FTEF while a S/F R of 15 generates about 6.5 FTEF.) Any reduction in the S/F R increases the teaching resources that colleges and departments have at their disposal, giving them the ability to move toward the three-course load. A major step toward reducing the SFR would be to fund colleges and departments at the appropriate SFR for the "mode and level" of the courses they are already teaching. For

11

example, funding the College of Humanities and the Arts at only 90% of the mode and level SFR for the courses it is now teaching would increase the College's FTEF allocation by almost 13 FTEF. This is equivalent to providing 65 sections of course relief to a regular faculty of 135. For other colleges, the figures are more dramatic.

The AIM Task Force recognizes that full implementation of the nine-unit model will require more faculty, cost money, and face various logistical and institutional difficulties. Still, without compromising the quality of instruction, there is no other way to improve the workload situation at SJSU on a large scale. This is not a radical or an unprecedented innovation, but a measure already implemented at most of the California Postsecondary Education Commission "comparison institutions" for the CSU. In fact, failure to implement the nine-unit model will increasingly isolate SJSU and relegate it to a

> ***In fact, failure to implement the nine-unit model will increasingly isolate SJSU and relegate it to a position outside the mainstream of similar institutions, and negatively affect our ability to recruit and retain high-quality faculty.***

---

[10] CSU Faculty Workload Report, see table 16.

[11] Or, in the case of the Library, *increasing* the Librarian/Student ratio, the commonly accepted measurement.

position outside the mainstream of similar institutions, and negatively affect our ability to recruit and retain high-quality faculty.

Recommendation 1a. Phasing in the Equitable Nine-Unit Model.

Beginning AY 2002-2003 SJSU should increase resources to the Colleges, by funding a progressive reduction in the student/faculty ratios within the Colleges, so that by AY 2007-2008 they will have succeeded in reducing teaching workload for t/tt faculty to an average of no more than nine units per semester, holding average class size constant, and allowing for equivalent workload alleviation for non-traditional academic units.

Benchmarks for each academic year, by the percentage of the total S/F R reduction that will be required to reach a fully implemented nine-unit model (and equivalent). The Budget Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate shall make any interpretations required to monitor the progress of implementation:

- *AY 2007-2008, full implementation*
- *AY 2006-2007, 75% implementation*
- *AY 2005-2006, 55% implementation*
- *AY 2004-2005, 35% implementation*
- *AY 2003-2004, 20% implementation.*
- *AY 2002-2003, 10% implementation.*

12

Since achieving the nine-unit model will be difficult and will take time, the AIM Task Force is concerned that interim measures be taken to alleviate workload as much as the budget will permit. As resources become available for the workload reduction effort, we recommend that the nine-unit model be gradually implemented, with increasing resources flowing to the colleges to hire faculty to reduce their S/F Rs. This transition to the nine-unit model will provide an opportunity to correct problems that may arise prior to full implementation. While the AIM Task Force believes that the assigned time provided during the transition should be given to all faculty in rotation, it recognizes that each department will need to confront and solve its own unique implementation issues. We believe that even modest relief during the transition will enhance morale and encourage academic innovation, scholarly activity, and service activity, if the university's commitment to more substantial long-term relief is unwavering and credible.

The AIM Task Force was specifically charged to provide benchmarks for the implementation of workload reforms. We believe that progress toward the nine-unit model should begin immediately, and given that $750,000 exists in base budget for the effort it is reasonable to expect, despite the current budget climate, that AY 2002-2003 could see 10% implementation of the model. The listed benchmarks require modest progress toward the goal early in the implementation period and more rapid progress toward the end. This reflects the current budget climate which we expect will improve in time, and also the need for time to be able to prepare to gear up for the financing of the reform. The Task Force believes that these benchmarks are achievable under the current budget climate, but acknowledges that a markedly worsening fiscal climate could delay implementation.

As noted before, the AIM Task Force is also aware that non-traditional academic units, such as the Library, will need to develop equivalencies to the nine-unit model. All t/tt faculty should receive comparable workload alleviation, even in those cases where the nine-unit model is not an appropriate model for their situation.

Recommendation 1b. Supporting interim progress toward the nine-unit model.

The University and colleges should support and encourage any academic program that endeavors to move toward or sustain a three-course or nine-unit load within existing financial and FTES parameters.

In principle, colleges and departments are now free to organize their workloads however they wish as long as their FTES targets are met, and, in fact, some departments and at least one college already have a standard teaching load of 3 courses, as do a number of departments and colleges at other campuses of the CSU. Generally, they do so by having larger class enrollments or by having a relatively high ratio of temporary to permanent faculty, or by extensive use of teaching assistants and teaching associates. In addition, some departments may find it both advantageous and possible to move from a teaching load of four 3-unit courses to one of three 4-

unit courses. Although these or other techniques may not be feasible or appropriate for all departments, the university should support any department or college that endeavors to move toward or sustain a three-course load within existing financial and FTES parameters.

Part of that encouragement will come by universal implementation of a reduction of S/FRs in all academic units as the primary funding mechanism for teaching workload reduction. In this way, academic units may feel free to find ways to achieve a nine-unit load under existing parameters without fearing that they will lose resources to those other units who have not. A commitment to lowering S/FRs will therefore stimulate academic units to experiment in workload alleviation.

Recommendation 1c. Tracking progress toward the nine-unit model.

The Budget Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate should review the University's progress toward implementing these recommendations and issue a progress report each semester until their final implementation. These progress reports should monitor the proportion of t/tt faculty reaching the nine-teaching-unit goal by department, college, and as a whole, average class sizes, and other useful workload information, and should be distributed to the Provost, Senate, and faculty more generally.

The campus as a whole needs to be regularly apprised of the progress being made toward achievement of the nine-unit model. Institutional Planning and Research should annually prepare the "SJSU Workload Report" for submission to all interested parties. This report should summarize, department by department, the numbers of t/tt currently teaching nine units or less and those teaching more than nine units. The report should also indicate class sizes, number of preparations, overall department S/F R, and any other

> *The campus as a whole needs to be regularly apprised of the progress being made toward achievement of the nine-unit model.*

workload related data that may be available. IPAR shall determine, with the aide of the Budget Advisory Committee, appropriate S/F R targets for AY 2007-8, which will enable all colleges to meet the nine-unit model without increasing class sizes. The annual workload report shall track progress, department by department, toward meeting their 2007-8 S/F R goals.

Recommendation 2. Sabbaticals.

All meritorious sabbaticals (sabbaticals that have been judged meritorious under the university policies regulating sabbaticals) should be funded.

The AIM Task Force believes that this would be a very useful interim step that might be feasible long before and in addition to the achievement of the nine-unit model. In some years, in some colleges, this is already achieved.

Funding all approved sabbaticals would especially benefit faculty in the early to middle stages of their careers. Currently, many senior faculty prefer to take difference-in-pay leaves for financial

> **All meritorious sabbaticals…should be funded.**

reasons, once the difference between their pay and the pay of their replacement rises to a high enough level. Sabbaticals, however, are preferred by newly tenured faculty, and should form a backbone of support for their professional development.

By a two to one majority, faculty in the CSU indicate that there are insufficient resources for faculty development.[12] Regular sabbaticals for faculty who produce worthy proposals would be a significant step toward addressing this challenge.

Recommendation 3. Workload Equity.

The Professional Standards Committee of the Academic Senate should prepare a workload equity policy for the Senate and, ultimately, the University to adopt. The policy should provide guidelines to the academic units on how to achieve equity in the distribution of faculty workload, in the context of alleviating workload.

The AIM Task Force is concerned that, in the process of reducing workload, we should also reduce those inequities in workload that have become entrenched under the old systems. One useful step to remedying these inequities would be for the university to construct guidelines that could be used by department chairs, deans, and others in allocating work among the faculty. These guidelines should embrace a pluralistic and flexible model of faculty workload. Faculty should, so far as possible, be able to

> **The AIM Task Force is concerned that, in the process of reducing workload, we should also reduce those inequities in workload that have become entrenched under the old systems.**

construct the work alternatives appropriate for them, provided that their total contribution is equivalent to that of others. The guidelines should provide a means for helping deans/chairs to see that workload is distributed fairly and relatively equally, while at the same time protecting

---

[12] CSU Faculty Workload Report, see table 16.

the ability of faculty to make individualized choices in shaping their own professional development. Not all faculty under the nine-unit model should necessarily teach nine units--this should be an average mix that reflects a diversity of choices made by faculty within the rubric of department needs.

In constructing the policy, Professional Standards should take into consideration the multiple dimensions of workload that the AIM Task Force has defined: increasing research expectations, increasing service requirements, and the multiple considerations of teaching workload (numbers of students, mode and level of instruction, numbers of preparations, hours in the classroom, supervisions of theses and other individualized projects, etc.)   Professional Standards should work closely with the Curriculum and Research Committee in making use of mode and level standards for helping to determine teaching workload (see recommendation 4.) Of particular importance is the necessity for seeing that graduate thesis supervision is fully rewarded in the workload system.

A set of workload profiles should be developed to demonstrate how faculty may, under the nine-unit model, engage in comparable work. Profiles should reflect all of the traditional profiles developed by Boyer as well as disciplinary differences on our campus: i.e., the differences between programs with quite different modes and levels of instruction. Not only will Scholar-Teachers, Teacher-Scholars, and Service-Teachers have different profiles from each other, but their profiles may also differ depending upon college and discipline.

Recommendation 4. Mode and Level of Instruction.

The Curriculum and Research Committee of the Academic Senate should prepare policy for the regular review and implementation of CSU guidelines on appropriate modes and levels of instruction. The University's curriculum should be reviewed and classifications updated, where appropriate. The policy should also specify how the updated modes and levels of instruction shall be used to help assure workload equity between faculty.

Already, different colleges are allocated different S/F Rs reflecting (in theory) the type of teaching they do. The basis for allocating those S/F Rs was once something called the "mode and level of instruction" as delineated in CSU guidelines that assigned different "C factors" to different kinds of classes (see earlier discussion: "Problems with the WTU system.") The AIM Task Force suspects that many of our courses are no longer appropriately classified, since this classification scheme was moribund for years until being recently revived for some purposes at SJSU. Nevertheless, we believe that workload is related to the appropriate pedagogy for each class. A class of twenty graduate students may be significantly more work than a class of 20 undergraduates, and these differences should be reflected in the workload assignments of individual faculty.

The CSU workload study confirms that CSU faculty report many hours of work each week in the arena of individualized student instruction.[13] This includes graduate and undergraduate thesis supervision, directed reading, and much more. An appropriate mode and level classification system should be capable of incorporating this important aspect of teaching when determining a faculty member's overall work assignment.

---

[13] CSU Faculty Workload Report, see table 13A.

By reviewing and updating the classification of the SJSU curriculum under the "mode and level"

> *A rational classification system for the curriculum is a crucial step toward achieving workload equity*

document we make it possible to compare teaching workload in ways that go beyond the sheer numbers of classes and students. A rational classification system for the curriculum is a crucial step toward achieving workload equity.

Recommendation 5. Committee reductions and support.

The University should move to a system of far fewer committees that meet more intensively and that are far better supported with assigned time.

- ***The Organization and Government Committee of the Academic Senate should prepare policy to dramatically consolidate university committees. Such a reduction must be accompanied with assigned time for all committee members who serve on the new, more intensive committees.***
- ***As colleges and departments receive funds to implement the nine-unit model, they should similarly pare committees and better reward, through assigned time, those who serve.***

The 1994 WASC accreditation report specifically "recommends that SJSU…streamline the committee structure so that faculty spend less time, but more directly impact, governance".[14] The AIM Task Force believes that our proposal will fulfill this important WASC recommendation. While some faculty may spend more of their time working on committees, they would be compensated with a reduction in their teaching workload. On a whole, the recommendation would result in fewer faculty who are subjected to multiple committee assignments. The Task Force does not propose to reduce the importance of service and governance activities, but to streamline them, better compensate them and, in effect, make them more professional and successful.

The current system of committees at SJSU does not do justice to faculty workload nor to academic governance. While all faculty are expected to do some service, the general rule is that they discharge their normal service duties (as anticipated in the 3/15 WTU formula) in their departments and colleges, by advising students, serving on local curriculum committees, job searches, etc. Service at the University level, however, is customarily seen as a function beyond the call of duty, despite the Senate's best efforts to place a university-level service requirement in the RTP policy.

Because faculty are reluctant to increase their workload by engaging in university-level service, the current system has been constructed with an eye toward preventing service from being too onerous—it has become the University's equivalent of uncompensated volunteer work. A vast array of committees has been constructed, each of which has a narrow charge. Nonetheless, university service is commonly shunned by the average faculty member. In Spring 2002, for example, most of the Senate seats up for election are unfilled or uncontested. One college, Social Science, has all four of its seats open and only one candidate.

By consolidating committees and better supporting them with assigned time, workload will be

---

[14] WASC, SJSU Report, 1994, p. 39.

substantially improved in two ways. First, many committee positions would be eliminated and faculty returned to their colleges and departments for their other duties. Second, those faculty who remained would receive some compensation for their increased workload.

As an important additional benefit, it is quite likely that governance would be dramatically improved. In the CSU Workload study, a clear majority of respondents disagreed with the statement that "Faculty Governance Participation was rewarded," and an equally clear majority disagreed with the statement that "Committee Participation is rewarded."[15] By placing genuine resources behind faculty governance and committee work, this measure might help to

> *In the CSU Workload study, a clear majority of respondents disagreed with the statement that "Faculty Governance Participation was rewarded,".... By placing genuine resources behind faculty governance and committee work, this measure might help to correct this problem at SJSU.*

correct this problem at SJSU. Interest in the Senate and other forms of university service would grow if faculty realize that participation in service does not result in an uncompensated increase in workload.

Organization and Government should consider ways in which a handful of policy committees could, through the use of multiple subcommittees, more regular meetings, etc., take on the functions of the current operating committees. The goal should be to increase committee effectiveness by rewarding a smaller (overall) number of committee members for their more intensive work.

As the nine-unit model comes into being, increasing numbers of t/tt faculty will receive assigned time. The AIM Task Force believes that colleges and departments should direct some of these resources to rewarding those faculty who take on the most demanding service loads at the department and college levels. This should be accompanied by a review of committee work similar to the university-level review mentioned above, with an eye toward shrinking the numbers of committees but providing much better support to those that remain.

Recommendation 6. Elimination of "unfunded mandates" and reduction of "underfunded mandates."

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate should prepare policies suspending the implementation of programs driven by "unfunded" or "underfunded mandates," and create policy that will prevent any similar measures in the future that result in a net increase in faculty workload. The Executive Committee should review all policies created or promulgated since 1990 that have had the effect of increasing faculty workload and eliminate, reduce, or reform as many as possible.

By unfunded mandates, we mean those programs that require additional work of faculty without providing concomitant support to faculty, chiefly in the form of assigned time. The most obvious such mandate in recent years has been the implementation of report-generating assessment measures in our general education program and more recently within the majors. However, the creation of faculty activity reports, post-tenure review, program planning, and a

---

[15] CSU Faculty Workload Report, see table 16.

whole host of similar activities also fall into the pattern of requiring faculty work without providing concomitant faculty compensation.

The committee discussed assessment work extensively. While the 1994 WASC accreditation report identified assessment as an area which SJSU needed to improve, the same report also

> *SJSU should not create self-inflicted workload wounds by being over zealous in implementation of bureaucratic and system mandates.*

discussed the real problem of faculty "overload."[16] Unfortunately, our efforts to improve assessment have also contributed to the overload experienced by faculty. If the newest assessment activities are of genuine importance to the university, then they should be funded appropriately so that they do not compound the overload problem also identified by WASC.

Besides assessment work, SJSU should not create self-inflicted workload wounds by being over zealous in implementation of bureaucratic and system mandates. On the contrary, a minimalist approach should be taken with compliance measures. Recently, Vice Chancellor David Spence proposed reducing program planning, indicating that the system administration did not make use of the reports it generates.[17] Post-tenure review also seems ripe for revision. In general, SJSU policies that have been created to fulfill external mandates should be examined carefully to determine if they require more work than is absolutely required, and they should be reduced in complexity and extent whenever possible.

Recommendation 7. Lottery funds for student assistance in workload alleviation.

The Budget Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate should review the assessment data generated by the Spring 2002 AIM workload alleviation program, and design a lottery category to fund the use of student assistants who can contribute to workload alleviation.

The spring workload alleviation program generated about $380,000 of proposed expenditures on student assistants, out of total available funds of $750,000. In reviewing the applications, the AIM Task Force was impressed with the many thoughtful and creative ways in which students could be used to help faculty cope with their work. Students,

> *AIM was impressed with the many thoughtful and creative ways in which students could be used to help faculty cope with their work.*

and not only faculty, stood to benefit from the program as they acquired positive work experiences in the university. We realizes that the short notice for fall applications may have made the use of student assistants more popular than they otherwise would have been, but nonetheless believe that this component of the program is well worth continuing, provided that it is understood that such expenditures are strictly supplementary to the other AIM recommendations.

The AIM Task Force envisions a lottery category of approximately $400,000 for student assistance in workload alleviation. Applications for this category should be drawn from departments or programs and vetted through the colleges and Library. Using the criteria we

---

[16] WASC, SJSU Report, 1994, p. 40.)
[17] Statement to the Academic Senate, CSU, March 8, 2002.

developed for the spring program categories 2 and 3, the B.A.C. should award grants with a *pro rata* cap on the size of the award for any department. The general rule should be that each department that produces a meritorious proposal should receive a fair share of the funds to hire student assistants.

The AIM Task Force believes that this program fits the two most important Lottery restrictions in much the same way as faculty development grants fit. First, these expenditures support innovation by freeing faculty to focus their attention on a host of pursuits that influence the instructional mission. Second, just as faculty development grants are annual expenditures and not ongoing line items, the student assistance grants would also be annual expenditures based upon a similar process of review each year. We expect that the program will become sufficiently popular that the university will wish to continue it, alongside faculty development grants, long after the nine-unit model is achieved.

Recommendation 8: Funding AIM

Fiscal Principle One: Funding the nine-unit model should be the University's highest budgetary priority. Initiatives unrelated to workload alleviation should be limited or delayed until after AIM recommendations are achieved.

Fiscal principle one reflects the reality that AIM recommendations are not achievable unless they are pursued by the whole campus, with a single-minded devotion, for a period of years. There will be many legitimate needs on campus that will have to go unmet if the AIM recommendations are to be achieved. There is no point in embarking on this serious undertaking unless the Senate, administration, and campus are willing to commit to achieving the Aim recommendations as their highest fiscal priority.

Fiscal Principle Two: Since **existing** ***funding sources will prove to be insufficient for full funding of AIM recommendations, SJSU budget leaders should see that AIM***

recommendations receive a significant portion of every **new** ***revenue stream coming to the university that can legally be used for this effort, until such time as full implementation is reached.***

Fiscal principle two discusses the general funding strategy. AIM recommendations must be funded primarily with revenues that the University does not currently possess. As the current fiscal crisis recedes and better times prevail, a portion of all new revenue streams should be directed toward the fulfillment of AIM objectives. In this way, SJSU may be able to grow itself into workload alleviation, by calling on the wide range of different sources of revenue that will eventually become available.

Fiscal Principle Three: The leadership of SJSU, including the Senate and its Budget Advisory Committee, and the President and his administration, should seek creative, entrepreneurial, responsible, and effective suggestions for raising the funds required for full implementation of AIM recommendations.

Fiscal principle three points out that discovering ways to fund AIM initiatives should be a shared responsibility. The AIM Task Force considers it beyond its charge and its capacity to offer an elaborate and detailed fiscal plan. It will take creativity, openness to new ideas, and considerable leadership to successfully implement AIM, especially in its fiscal dimensions. We offer a list of suggestions in that spirit. The Task Force believes that all of these alternatives, not just one or two, must be aggressively pursued in order to provide the fiscal base for workload reform.

I. ***Whenever enrollment growth dollars are available, the first use should be to prevent the current faculty/student ratio and the permanent/temporary ratios of faculty from deteriorating, and to improve these ratios if possible, taking into consideration the other enrollment dependent needs of the university.***

One of the primary sources of new revenues that SJSU receives comes in the form of the additional state support for the additional students that we accept, as well as the fees that these students pay. The nine-unit model cannot ultimately be achieved solely with the use of these enrollment growth funds, but its achievement can be made impossible unless a sufficient portion of these funds are used to, at a minimum, maintain the existing S/F R.

II. ***The university should make the solicitation of endowed funds for faculty support a high priority.***

The AIM Task Force believes that launching a major campaign, with the objective of raising endowment to support faculty as the core of the campaign, is an essential element toward achieving the objectives of AIM.

III. ***SJSU should utilize grants, contracts, CE Revenue Trust, Lottery and all other discretionary funds available to support strategies that alleviate faculty workload. As the University finishes implementation of CMS, it should redirect one-time CMS expenditures toward strategies to alleviate faculty workload. These sources of funds may be particularly suitable for funding year to year annual expenses such as the sabbatical program and the provision of assigned time.***

SJSU is an "early follower" in the implementation of the CMS system, meaning that we are currently experiencing huge costs associated with conversion to this software package. As implementation of this conversion is attained and expenditures decrease, the AIM Task Force recommends that equivalent expenditures be directed toward funding assigned time and the expanded sabbatical program. The one-time expenditures on CMS, which were presented to the Senate in November as $1,512,000 for 2001-2002, have been funded through grants from the Foundation, donations from Spartan Shops, one-time 'charges' to revenue funds, and annual allocations from any university roll-forward balances. These same sources should be used, wherever legally they can, for the one-time recurring cost of sabbaticals and assigned time. This should lessen the shock of implementation as one major effort (CMS) is replaced with another major effort (expanded sabbaticals and assigned time).

IV. The base budget of the University   should be scrutinized to determine if there are portions that can be legally and responsibly shifted to year to year recurring costs, so as to free permanent funds for faculty hiring.

A central difficulty in supporting progress toward the nine-unit model is that many available funds are not permanent and thus cannot be used for the permanent hiring of faculty. For example, grants, contracts, CE Revenue Trust, Lottery and contributions from Spartan Shops, and other discretionary funds fall into this category. However, these funds can sometimes can be used to replace base funds that can be shifted to faculty hiring. For example, the current 47 sabbaticals (not the proposed expanded program) appear to be funded from the base, but since they are one-time recurring expenditures they could be funded with a wide range of one-time funds. If they were entirely funded from such sources, the existing base dollars might be transferred to hire some of the faculty needed to attain the nine-unit model.

V. SJSU should take a lead role in coordinating campus activism throughout the state to influence the state legislative process, by contacting regional legislators in their home offices. The Academic Senate should craft a Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing specific changes in the California Department of Finance marginal cost funding formula, support for graduate education on the "12 units = full time model", and fee policy, and should use this resolution as a foundation for a campaign to reform legislative funding of the CSU.

Finally, the Academic Senate should craft a Sense of the Senate Resolution urging that the Legislature change the funding mechanisms for the CSU in specific ways, based upon the analysis developed in ASCSU's September 2001 report *Meeting the Needs of the People of California.* The Academic Senate should solicit the cooperation of the ASCSU, CSU, CFA, and all local campuses in a coordinated effort to approach legislators in their home offices. Each campus should send a delegation, to consist of the President of the University, President of the local chapter of CFA, and Chair of the Academic Senate, to jointly and cooperatively approach members of the Legislature who represent their service regions, in their local offices.

> *The Academic Senate should solicit the cooperation of the ASCSU, CSU, CFA, and all local campuses in a coordinated effort to approach legislators in their home offices.*

VI. SJSU students should consider campus fee increases to support the academic mission of the university, if fees can be shown to significantly enhance the quality of their education.

Students at some other campuses in the CSU have approved additional fees to help improve the quality of their education. Before crafting a fee proposal, students should investigate the success of similar programs at San Luis Obispo, San Diego, and other CSU campuses and choose the model that will work best for SJSU. Faculty workload is an area of interest to students, since it is directly related to the quality of teaching and advising, student retention, and the reputation of their university and the degrees they earn.

Appendix A
Summary of Fall 2001 Process and Outcomes

During Summer 2001, the Provost's Executive Council, comprised of the Council of Deans and the Council of AVPs, met in a two-day off-site retreat to discuss and establish campus academic investment priorities for the short and long-term. The top investment priority identified during the retreat was "Faculty Workload/Morale/Sabbaticals."

As a result, early in the Fall 2001 semester, Provost Goodman worked with the Academic Senate to form and charge the AIM Task Force (official charge and membership memo attached). Provost Goodman allocated $1,000,000 to the Task Force for use in Spring 2002 to alleviate faculty workload; that allocation was subsequently reduced to $750,000 due to unforeseen system-wide budget difficulties.

Task Force Chairs Peter and Nance convened the initial meeting of the Task Force, during which it was established that the Task Force would meet weekly throughout the semester. Two primary tasks were identified: develop and implement a short-term process for expending the 2001-02 allocation during the Spring 2002 semester, and produce a report describing a model for long-term faculty workload alleviation.

The short-term first task absorbed the vast majority of the Task Force's time during the Fall 2001 semester. The first discussion and debate focused on whether the funds should be spent in a quick flurry of activity in the spring or rolled over to Fall 2002 when they could be used for more structured and planned purposes. Finally, it was recommended that departments be encouraged to use the money in the spring, but could choose to roll it over if they wish.

Once the recommendation was completed to encourage use of the funds in Spring 2002, the discussion then turned to what types of workload alleviation activities would be feasible on short

notice. The Task Force agreed that a "one size fits all" model would not be appropriate, as departments would have different needs and capabilities for use of the funds. Therefore, after several rounds of discussion and revision, it was agreed that four categories of activities should be funded:

1. Reassignment of faculty time. (Reassignment of faculty time is not an option in the Summer.)

2. Hiring graduate assistants, teaching assistants, or student assistants to help individual unit 3 faculty with their teaching assignment. Such hires should be above the historic norms for the department and represent new faculty support opportunities that would not be available or funded otherwise.

3. Hiring graduate assistants or student assistants to help individual tenured or tenure-track faculty with their scholarly assignment. Such hires should be above the historic norms for the department and represent new faculty support opportunities that would not be available or funded otherwise.

4. Other Uses. Departments may submit proposals for other activities in Spring or Summer 2002 not listed in 1-3 above. Proposals in this category will be reviewed by the AIM Task Force to determine eligibility for funding based on the activity's direct contribution to alleviating faculty workload.

A set of guidelines and timelines for departmental proposals to use AIM funds was distributed in November 2001, with a deadline of December 10, 2001 for submission to the AIM Task Force (copy attached). The Task Force then met on December 13, 2001 to review and approve department proposals as appropriate within the Task Force guidelines. Proposals considered within Categories 1, 2 and 3 were accepted with cursory review, and the majority of the review then focused on the Category 4 proposals.

Uses of Funds by Departments

With only a few exceptions, departments submitted reasonable and acceptable proposals. Details of the submissions within the four categories are as follows:

Category 1. Reassignment of faculty time.
    Number of Proposals: 22
    Total Dollars: $258,151
    Total FTEF reassigned: 10.35

Category 2. Student Assistants to help with teaching assignment.
    Number of Proposals: 41
    Total Dollars: $342,732

Category 3. Student Assistants to help with scholarly assignment.

Number of Proposals: 6
Total Dollars: $37,251

Category 4. Other Uses.
    Number of Proposals: 12
    Total Dollars: $62,374

Roll-Forward Requests:
    Number of Proposals: 8
    Total Dollars: $65,426

In reviewing the Category 4 proposals, the Task Force found that most were clearly acceptable towards the goal of alleviating faculty workload and were quickly approved. Examples included hiring part-time faculty or Graduate Assistants to do advising, hiring student assistants to do relevant technology (i.e., web/database) development, providing summer stipends to alleviate Fall workload, etc. A few proposals that were unclear were referred back to the department to clarify and/or revise, and were eventually approved. By the start of the Spring 2002 semester, essentially all department proposals for use or roll-forward of their AIM funds were approved.

Appendix B
Senate Construction of AIM

SM-F01-1 (As amended by SM-F01-3)

At its meeting of September 10, 2001, the 2001-2002 Executive Committee, acting as the Academic Senate (By-Law 3.3b), passed the following Senate Management Resolution presented by Kenneth Peter.

SENATE MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION
Establishment of an Academic Innovation Model (AIM) Task Force

Whereas, The mission of SJSU would be enhanced if its faculty were more substantially empowered to innovate in research, teaching, and service; and

Whereas, Innovation is currently limited for many faculty both by the inflexibility of the so-called "4/4" teaching schedule and by a lack of sufficient resources, support structure, and time; and

Whereas, Greater flexibility in scheduling and the provision of additional resources would make it possible for faculty to develop new curricula, improve the quality of teaching, engage (with students and others) in leading research programs, advise, orient, and retain students, participate in the life and improvement of the university through service functions, and improve the morale and climate of the university; and

Whereas, The Provost has identified and will commit substantial resources to support a more innovative workload distribution as early as Spring 2002, and has expressed his desire for advice regarding the most effective way of allocating those resources both for Spring 2002 and the longer term; now, therefore, be it

Resolved,   That an ad hoc university committee be formed to create an academic innovation model (the AIM Task Force), with the structure, charge, tasks and membership shown on the attached document; the members of the committee shall be appointed by the Provost after close consultation with the Executive Committee; be it further

Resolved, That the AIM Task Force promptly recommend to the Provost how best to distribute currently available resources in order to foster academic innovation during the Spring 2002 semester; be it further

Resolved,   That the AIM Task Force submit its long-term recommendations to the Provost and the Academic Senate by March 2002, at which time the Academic Senate shall discuss the long-term recommendations provided by the AIM Task Force and shall, by Sense-of-the-Senate resolution, provide its evaluation of the report and offer any additional advice it deems necessary; and be it

Resolved,   Long-term recommendations   provided by the AIM Task Force will be
          forwarded to the appropriate campus bodies for implementation, such as Senate Policy
          Committees on matters concerning policy changes, Academic Affairs on matters
          concerning administrative implementation issues, etc. The AIM Task Force will cease
          to exist as soon as it transmits its recommendations to the Senate and the Provost.

The Ad Hoc University Committee to construct an Academic Innovation Model
(AIM Task Force)

Structure

Co Chairs:
1.   Kenneth Peter (Executive Committee, Academic Senate)
2.   Bill Nance (Office of the Provost)

Membership:
3.   Dean
4.   Dean
5.   Associate Dean
6.   Representative for Department Chairs (faculty)
7.   Representative for Department Chairs (faculty)
8.   Representative of Executive Committee, Academic Senate (faculty)
9.   Faculty member at large
10.   Faculty member at large
11.   Faculty member at large
12.   Faculty member at large
13.   Faculty member from General Unit
14.   Lecturer
15.   CFA representative as non-voting technical advisor on contract issues.
16.   AVP/IPAR as non-voting technical advisor on budget and resource issues.
17.   AVP/FA as non-voting technical advisor on contract and faculty development issues.

28

All members to be selected are to represent campus diversity including representation of all
colleges, differing stages of faculty career development, differing kinds of administrative
experience, and membership in differing campus/community constituencies.

Charge

The AIM Task Force is charged to promote the highest-quality academic environment possible
in all disciplines throughout San José State University by fostering academic innovation among
faculty and the work in which they are involved. After wide consultation with campus
communities, including students, and working within the framework of Senate documents on
appointment, rank and tenure, and the MOU, and based on established principles of faculty
development, including but not limited to Boyer's model, the task force will strive to nurture an

appropriate mix of the various types of faculty   work that result (e.g., the Teacher-Scholar, the Scholar-Teacher, the Service-Teacher, etc.)

The task force should begin with the premise that successful academic innovation depends in large measure upon investment of resources in faculty so that faculty can direct a portion of their time and energy toward innovations in teaching, scholarship, and service. To this end, the AIM Task Force is more specifically charged to undertake the following tasks:

- Create an open, clear and fair means to allocate resources identified by the Provost that serves   to foster academic innovation in Spring 2002, and which may serve as a model for a more permanent policy for distributing resources to foster academic innovation in subsequent years.

- Identify additional resources, from both existing and potential new sources, that can be used to support and enhance academic innovation in the short term and into the future.

- Develop a model depicting what faculty workload should look like in 2007, create a plan for achieving this model over time, and develop benchmarks for identifying progress towards this model.

Appendix C
Cost Estimates for Recommendations

Recommendation 1. The Nine-Unit Model.

Amount: $8.3 million minimum.

Explanation: This amount would enable SJSU to approach the nine-unit model, while holding class sizes constant and maintaining a ratio of permanent to temporary faculty of 70:30. It includes salaries, benefits, and allowances for OE&E support and office support for new positions. The AIM Task Force notes that the stimulation of academic innovation would require an even more substantial investment of resources above this bare minimum.

Recommendation 2. Sabbaticals.

Amount: $1.5 million maximum.

Explanation: This is the additional amount that would be required to fund every eligible faculty member for a sabbatical every seven years (current number of sabbaticals: 47; total required: 102.) However, many faculty may choose to opt for a Difference in Pay leave instead of a sabbatical, as they presently do, which would lower the cost substantially, and other factors might prevent every eligible faculty member from taking a sabbatical. Thus, this amount is a maximum.

Recommendation 3. Equity.

Amount: no cost.

Explanation: this recommendation is designed to produce guidelines to help distribute workload more equitably between faculty. The implementation of the Recommendation 1 (nine-unit model) will create opportunities to make the system of work more equitable, and contains any costs that may be associated with Recommendation 3.

Recommendation 4. Mode and Level of Instruction.

Amount: no cost.

Explanation: this recommendation is designed to help with Recommendation 3, and contains no costs of its own. Obviously, better funding for thesis supervision, graduate seminars etc. would be costly, but this cost is subsumed in Recommendation 1 (nine-unit model.) A transition to a nine-unit model would create the flexibility required to distribute workload in an equitable way, with more attention paid to the mode and level of instruction, and according to equity guidelines developed by the Senate.

Recommendation 5. Committee Reductions and Support.

Amount: $85,000 - $220,000.

Explanation: This amount is to purchase assigned time for members of the Senate policy committees. Currently the Senate receives 2.0 assigned time, the University RTP committee receives .80, the Library Board receives .2, and BOGS receives 1.40. Current expenditures on assigned time for University service are about $200,000.

$85,000 would pay for a course of assigned time (one per year) for each Senator over and above the current appropriation for Senate officers. $220,000 would pay for two courses of assigned time (one per semester) for each Senator over and above the current appropriation for Senate officers.

Recommendation 6. Reduction or elimination of "unfunded mandates" and "underfunded mandates."

Amount: $150,000 - $300,000.

Explanation: $150,000 would provide one course of assigned time for each of approximately 15 GE courses in review and one course of assigned time for each of 15 program majors in review. Note that this would not cover ongoing assessment but could provide some extra help for those coordinators who must supervise data collection and generate reports, which occurs less frequently. $300,000 would provide two courses of assigned time for the same efforts, or broader coverage. For example, it could provide one course of assigned time for each of 45 GE courses and 15 program majors.

Recommendation 7. Lottery funds for student assistance in workload alleviation.

Amount: $400,000 of lottery funds.

Explanation: The recommendation is fairly self-explanatory. AIM allocated $380,000 for similar purposes in Spring 2002, so a total annual budget of $400,000 would be a substantial reduction below Spring 2002 levels. However, as a supplement to the nine-unit model this seems like a reasonable amount—large enough to constitute a substantial program worth the time

of the Budget Advisory Committee to administer, and small enough to leave plenty of lottery funds left to run the more traditional Faculty Development Grants and other programs. This, and not faculty assigned time, seems like the most appropriate portion of the AIM spring program to be transferred to Lottery funding.