FACULTY WORKLOAD: TOWARDS A MORE EQUITABLE ASSIGNMENT AND EVALUATION

Dr. Rhonda Chipman-Johnson

Division Of Humanities
The College of The Bahamas

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews selected literature on workload, noting critical issues and efforts directed at a more equitable estimation, assignment and evaluation of faculty workload. It underlines the need to consider all factors and aspects of faculty work in assigning and evaluating workload. A flexible approach to evaluation is advocated since faculty have different strengths and interests and departments have different demands and requirements. It is also suggested that flexible formulas may be applied in evaluating faculty at The College of The Bahamas and that they need not be measured in an identical or uniform manner.

INTRODUCTION

The issue of faculty workload continues to be a controversial and troubling question in higher education. Indeed, it is the "most consistent and pressing interest of prospective new faculty members" according to Mancing (1991,p.44). The essence of the problem is one of equity: How can administrators ensure fairness in the assignment and evaluation of work and duties performed by faculty? Many faculty members are dissatisfied with the traditional means of measuring and evaluating their work (Boyer, 1990) and are concerned about how their work activities are rewarded. On a more personal level, this problem is of particular concern to me because a number of lecturers at my institution, The College of The Bahamas, have expressed similar concerns with respect to the unequal distribution of work and an evaluation system which fails to give adequate credit for the amount of work actually done by faculty.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to discuss how faculty workload can be fairly estimated and evaluated. The operational definition used in this paper is that of Yuker: "Faculty workload refers to all faculty activities that are related to professional duties and responsibilities, teaching, research, interacting with students, institutional service, service to the community and professional development", (Yuker:1984,p.5).

College Forum, vol. 7 (1995) https://doi.org/10.15362/ijbs.v7i0.18

This paper first reviews selected literature on workload, noting critical issues and efforts directed at a more equitable estimation, assignment and evaluation of faculty workload. Next, it analyses the literature consulted in order to determine areas of consensus and directions for further research. Finally, it suggests how proposals in the literature can be used to improve the assignment and evaluation of workload in the Humanities Division at The College of The Bahamas.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Definition and perception of workload

One's perception or definition of workload is an important dimension of the problem. A narrow definition might simply refer to the number of assigned teaching hours whereas a broader definition might include all tasks performed by faculty which are related to professional duties (Yuker, 1984). Morrow's (1990) survey showed that "teaching load" and "workload" are not synonymous. The average teaching load in both private and public universities ranged from 4 to 8 courses (3 units or credits each) with a mean of 6 courses, while the total workload (i.e., teaching and non-teaching duties) ranged from "a low of 16 to a high of 30 units" (p.56). So, to talk in terms of "teaching load" rather than "workload" can be misleading (Mancing, 1991).

The concept of faculty workload is poorly understood by many lay persons. Members of the general public and some legislators believe that faculty have an easy job because they only look at the number of teaching hours. However, Winkler (1992) submits that workload entails more than classroom teaching and teaching involves preparation, consultation with students and evaluation of their work, which adds up to far more time than the 50 minutes spent in each class. Similarly, Mancing (1991) points out that critics do not see the professors who work long hours at home or in the laboratory, preparing lectures and materials, nor the energy they devote to original scholarship, the advisement of students and so on. He also notes that the relationship between the three types of work that faculty do is very complex, that "a professor's day is fragmented into a series of loosely related and extremely varied activities" (p.46). Given the above, it is easy to see why in certain court cases the definition of half-time teaching as 20 hours per week was problematic - it does not capture the complexity of workload (Yuker, 1984).

Nonetheless, pressure is being put on the universities to account for the work their faculty do. Winkler (1992) gives the example of New Mexico where all public colleges and universities are required to report the number of hours spent in advising students, the percent of lower-division courses taught by senior professors and so on. Along similar lines, Mooney (1992b) observes that seven states have some kind of

legislation regarding faculty workload. In addition, she points out that, at Harvard, it was recommended that data be collected on each professor's activities, teaching assignments, number of theses under supervision etc.. Although Yuker's (1984) extensive review of studies on workload indicates that faculty devote an average of 55 hours (45 hours in studies not based solely on faculty reports) per week to professional activities, critics observe that these data are based on self-report, which is true, for the most part. Clearly, there is a need to define and demonstrate cogently what faculty workload entails.

ESTIMATING WORKLOAD FOR ASSIGNMENT AND EVALUATIVE DECISIONS

Traditional formulas

Traditionally, the assignment of faculty workload has been largely based on the number of contact hours or credit hours taught. While this kind of basis for assignment may be suitable for administrators, it is inadequate because it fails to reflect the wide variation or fluctuation in time required to teach different types of courses (Hill, 1969). Further, though contact hours might be a better indication of work time than credit hours, they still oversimplify workload and do not reflect the complexity of faculty responsibilities (Yuker, 1984). Yuker's review revealed that the credit hour is not a reliable index of total load and, in fact, some studies showed that the total number of hours faculty work per credit hour varies from about two to eight. These sentiments are echoed by Hammons and Schade (1983) who state that the calculation of workload based on credit hours is an obsolete practice which should be "retired to a museum of higher education" (p.37). Yet, despite the evidence that the credit hour is an unsuitable measure of faculty workload, many colleges and universities continue to use them as a basis for assignment of work (Yuker, 1984).

Non-traditional Formulas

Increasingly, it is being recognized that non-traditional formulas might have to be used in assigning and assessing workload. In addition to credit and contact hours, a number of other factors are now being considered in the assignment and measurement of workload. Hauck (1969) suggests that factors such as class size, the number of sections taught, the experience of professors with particular courses, as well as their general experience, should be taken into account. In the engineering department he describes, the number of hours required to teach a course per week is determined by a formula which looks at 1) time spent in preparation for a class; 2) time spent in class; 3) time spent in instruction outside of class per student; and 4) the number of sections taught. Additionally, extra-instructional activities which relate to the mission of the

university and are non-remunerative are also assessed. Tabulation of these kinds of data can help to facilitate a more equitable distribution of functions.

Along similar lines, Hill (1969) points to the need to analyze teaching assignments to assess the number of hours spent in this area per week. He illustrates how the number of hours required to teach 12 credit hours per week can fluctuate from 28 to 88 per week depending on the types of courses taught. Yuker's review also showed that the type of course is an important factor to be considered. Further, allowance must be made for the teaching of new courses. Hill also notes that no single device or scale will measure workload effectively. However, whatever scale is used, the total or full workload must be taken into account.

The importance of looking at factors other than the traditional ones is underscored in the survey conducted by Hammons and Schade (1983). In this survey of 34 community colleges which used non-traditional formulas, 57 factors were identified (including the traditional ones). Workload factors which were used in one third or more of the institutions included factors such as instruction methods, contact hours, number of students, new courses, duplicate preparation, office hours, preparation time etc.. Unfortunately, only 10 of the 34 colleges using non-traditional formulas allowed their faculty to be surveyed. The researcher attributed this reluctance to participate to the sensitive nature of the survey. A total of 206 full-time faculty from 10 colleges were invited to participate. Of the 76% (a reasonable percent) of faculty members who returned their surveys, 62% indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the workload formulas and 80% believed the ideal workload formula should consider all duties performed by faculty.

The class size factor, which is considered in most non-traditional formulas, remains a point of contention. Yuker submits that more research is needed to determine the amount of time spent grading papers which could vary according to class size. He believes it might be more meaningful to look at the number and types of assignments and who grades them rather than the class size per se. Yuker's argument seems valid because Hill's (1969) example of ten types of teaching assignments shows that level and type of course can have a greater effect on time needed than class size.

Differences in workload duties

In addition to the factors mentioned above, other elements seem to account for variation or differences in workload assignments. Morrow (1990) points out that faculty in different schools on the same campus have different workload duties. In some liberal art schools, for example, workload consists mainly of teaching duties. In contrast, faculty in schools of education and other professional schools could have a

wide variety of non-teaching responsibilities - e.g., supervision of teachers, supervision of fieldwork students, writing and coordinating grants etc. The type of institution also has an impact on the kind of assignment of workload. Teaching loads are usually lowest at research universities and highest at community colleges (Yuker, 1984). However, reduced loads do not necessarily result in greater research productivity as faculty have different levels of interest in research. Further, it appears that rank influences the assignment of workload as in many instances senior professors have lighter workloads (Mancing, 1991; Yuker, 1984). As far as sex is concerned, there does not seem to be a significant difference in the assignment of the instructional load of men and women (McLaughlin et al, 1983).

The teaching versus research debate

Although faculty might wish to be assessed in all work-related activities, the prevailing system tends to reward work in the area of research more highly than other components of workload. Soderberg (1985) describes this dominance as "an unrelenting tyranny" and contends that it does not reflect the realities of academic life nor the wishes of faculty in many instances. In essence, there is a "hierarchy of functions" (Boyer, 1990) with teaching taking second place to research. Boyer sums up the problem very eloquently: "Almost all colleges pay lip service to the trilogy of teaching, research and service, but when it comes to making judgments about professional performance, the three are rarely assigned equal merit" (p.15). Consequently, an imbalance in the evaluation of research and teaching results. Service is relegated to the status of a "poor relation". Promotion and salary increases seem to be influenced by the quantity (as opposed to the quality) of articles published (Boyer, 1990; Soderberg, 1985). Yet, there is a weak correlation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness (Kremer, 1991). As a result of the pressure to publish, teaching is less of a concern at some major universities. Thus, the teaching-research debate "has become intertwined with the question of workload" (Winkler, 1992,p.40). Critics complain about the amount of time devoted to research which undermines attention to teaching.

Concern over this imbalance between teaching and research has led a number of institutions to focus more on all aspects of faculty work, especially teaching. It is suggested that reward structures should consider the multiple purposes of higher education and the varied skills of faculty (Soderberg, 1985). Equally, Boyer (1990) calls for a new vision of scholarship, an expanded definition which will give "full scope to academic work" (p.16). He advocates that higher education should reward four kinds of scholarship: discovery, integration, application and teaching. Institutions such as Syracuse University and the University of California at Berkley have decided to give greater weight to teaching in promotion and tenure decisions (Winkler, 1992; Mooney, 1992a). Support for this position is evidenced in the Leigh and Anderson

(1992) study of tenure and promotion practices at schools of journalism, which found that even though the publication record still seemed to carry more weight, the composite faculty member promoted in 1990-1991 excelled in both teaching and research. They note, however that faculty who met Boyer's expanded definition of scholarship tended to have a good chance for advancement. It appears, then, that some institutions are moving away from excessive emphasis on research.

Recommendations for assignment and evaluation of workload

Most suggestions for more equitable assignment and evaluation of faculty workload underline the need for flexibility. While all faculty members should have comparable total workloads (Mancing, 1991) workload standards need not be uniform for all institutions (Winkler, 1992). It is important to recognize that not all professors excel equally in the three areas of teaching, research and service. Thus, it is conceivable that workload distributions may vary but the overall effort of the department should be compatible with the mission of the university (Mancing, 1991). This means that departments could operate with different patterns and expectations (Winkler, 1992) as long as these were congruent with their goals. Therefore, in assigning workloads, department heads should "allow for all possible deviations within the three subsets of teaching, research and service (Combs, 1986, p.209).

In order to allow for this kind of flexibility, and recognize the diverse talents of faculty, a number of writers have proposed "creativity contracts" (e.g., Boyer, 1990). Combs (1986), for example suggests that a contract regarding the workload assignment and the basis for evaluation should be worked out between the department head and the faculty member at the beginning of the year. He describes a scheme based on the "almost universal maximum teaching load" of 12 contact hours for those not involved in research plus 3 hours for service. The work week is based on a 40-hour week, with 15 contact hours (including service) plus 25 hours for preparation, evaluation and so on. The manner in which the 15 contact hours (points) are allocated is negotiated between the individual faculty member and the department head. Thus, the 15 points could be divided in a number of ways: teaching 9, research 3, and service 3 (9,3,3) or other permutations such as 6,3,6 or 12,1,2. The department comes to a decision regarding the time involvement of various duties and the department head has to be consistent in the use of the agreed standards. Factors such as the time to teach a new course, the level of course etc. are taken into account. So, for instance, strict adherence to clearly defined standards or criteria in the English department would result in equitable workloads for the faculty involved. Combs submits that this method "recognizes the importance of all phases of a faculty member's job and gives credit for all the tasks he is performing" (p.212).

Other writers have recommended similar contracts or arrangements. Mancing (1991), for example, suggests that although many universities use the 40-40-20 workload formula, different formulas could be negotiated with the department chair. Assuming that each class is equal to about 10% of the load, a professor could opt to do 10% teaching, 90% research while another might be more involved in teaching. Adjustments could be made for faculty who have to supervise theses or do other types of supervision. The 10% workload credit may be increased or decreased proportionally according to the difficulty of the course. This kind of willingness to sanction variations in workload is reflected in the recent minutes (March, 1993) of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Purdue University. In the evaluation of faculty, "percentages will be assigned 30% Research, 30% Teaching, 20% Service and 20% will be rolling to support individual strengths". The proof of the pudding, of course, is whether faculty who decide to devote the extra 20% to teaching or service would be evaluated as highly as those who opt to devote this 20% to research.

Along similar lines, Savoie and Sawyer (1991) propose a model in which positions are designated as teaching or research-oriented at the time of appointment. Under this system, a research position could stipulate a 6-hour teaching load and at least 4 published articles a year, weighting publication as the main factor in evaluation. In contrast, a teaching position might entail a 12-hour teaching load and depend more on student evaluations. Boyer's (1990) example of Georgia State University College of Business Administration shows a similar concern for flexibility in contracts. In that college, professors are allowed to choose from five career profiles: the traditional one, weighting teaching and research equally; a teaching profile; a service profile; a research profile; and administrative profile.

The idea of flexible assignment of workload through creativity contracts seems to be valid since it is apparent that there are different types of faculty and effort expended in particular areas of work is related to the kind of recognition the work receives. In a study of faculty types at a large midwestern university, using peer ratings, Kremer (1991) found five types of faculty: All Stars who were involved in research, teaching and service; Teachers and Good Citizens who engaged in teaching and service; Teachers who were involved mainly in teaching; Researchers who did mostly research; and the Uninvolved who were low in all areas. It is significant that All Stars and Researchers received the highest increases over the three-year period studied. Kremer concluded that the "existence and prevalence of types is influenced by the variety of historic practices: hiring, salary, promotion, tenure, course load" (p.359). Faculty therefore spend their time where they will be rewarded. Similarly, Blackburn et al (1991), in their study of motivational variables (for faculty in arts and sciences) which account for the work effort given to teaching, found that faculty give more time to teaching if they are interested and believe their institution cares,

regardless of rank, department or specialty. Thus, it seems crucial that chairs should consider faculty types and interests in assigning workload.

Evaluation schemes will vary according to the needs of institutions or departments. However, they are most equitable when the categories, the weighting of different kinds of work and the various methods of evaluation are determined through negotiation with faculty. Seldin (1980) describes two models which show how workload is evaluated and the weightings applied according to the goals of the institution. In the first model, both quantity and quality factors of teaching performance are considered. Faculty have input regarding broad categories for evaluation, the number of units given for each category, the weights for teaching-related activities and the values of categories. Teaching and other duties are negotiated at the beginning of the year. In the quantitative component of instructional responsibilities, differences in duties with respect to number of contact hours, preparations, evening and Saturday classes etc. are tabulated and awarded different weights. In the qualitative component, instruction is assessed through student ratings while the chair evaluates the course design and institutional service. Other qualitative measures could include class visits and portfolio assessment. In this model, performance is measured in terms of whether it is above or below the acceptable level.

In the second model described by Seldin, three areas are rated: teaching effectiveness (on the basis of student evaluations, faculty involvement in curriculum development, teaching methods); Professional development (both quantitative and qualitative); Service (committee work and other kinds of service-related duties are weighted). It is important to note that a scheme has been worked out to assess both the quantity and quality of publications. In this model, teaching takes priority so the scores are multiplied by descending weights. However, other "special incidents" can also affect the total score. The important considerations are that faculty are involved in both the assignment and evaluation of workload and that the system should be applied consistently to all faculty.

Evaluation of workload assignments previously negotiated between faculty and department heads therefore becomes an easier and fairer process. Faculty know the weighting of the different kinds of workload (Savoie & Sawyerr, 1991). In addition, though measurements may not be totally precise, differences in faculty assignments are recognized. For instance, in the plan described by Magnusen (1987), scores in the three areas are multiplied by the "effort" (an approximation of the time spent in each area). Further, faculty know what is expected of them and can be assured that all of their work is recognized. In the model outlined by Combs (1986), faculty know which requirements are "expected" and which are "extra" in the three areas of work as lists (though not exhaustive) of typical duties in each area are drawn up. Satisfactory completion of the "expected" duties gives a faculty member an average rating on a

scale of 1 to 7. Before meeting with the head, faculty members complete the evaluation form with the appropriate documentation. With regard to giving an account of the work done, the documentation described by both Watkins (1990) and Diodato (1983) would provide valuable information for evaluation. Watkins describes efforts at Ball State to experiment with a teaching portfolio to ensure that teaching is examined along with research in promotion and tenure decisions. Diodato's work is more comprehensive as it is a case study in which he documented his own work activities (in teaching, research and service) over a 20-week period, using a diary method.

In sum, the underlying view in many of the models (especially that of Combs, 1986) described here is that regardless of variations in workload assignments, faculty should receive equitable rewards and their efforts in all areas should be recognized. This means that there should be a "clear and direct ratio" between the effort devoted by faculty to the three areas of work and the allocation of rewards by the administration (Mancing, 1990). It is also imperative that faculty play an integral role in both the assignment and the evaluation of their work.

ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE

The articles and works reviewed for this paper fall into several categories: 1) Reviews of the literature on workload activities and policies (e.g. Yuker, 1984); 2) opinion papers on faculty workload (e.g., Mancing 1991;Soderberg, 1985;Winkler, 1992); 3) newspaper/chronicle articles on issues concerning faculty work activities (e.g., Mooney 1992 a;Watkins 1990); 4) descriptions of workload models/formulas (e.g., Combs, 1986;Hill, 1969;Savoie & Sawyerr, 1991;Magnusen, 1989); 5) studies or surveys on aspects of workload/work activities (e.g. Blackburn et al, 1991;Kremer, 1991); 6) case studies (e.g., Diodato, 1983); and 7) Books/special reports on faculty work or evaluation (e.g., Boyer, 1990;Seldin, 1980).

While these articles focus on many different aspects of faculty workload and it is recognized that institutions have different emphases and goals, there appears to be consensus on the following aspects or at least a trend to do the following:

1. Determine formulas for assignment and evaluation which will account for all types and aspects of faculty work;
2. Create contracts (strongly suggested in several articles) that allow for flexible assignment of workload and, as a result, clear expectations regarding evaluation;
3. Build on faculty strengths as they represent many different types;
4. Create more balance between research and teaching activities;

5. Create more balance between a professor's needs and abilities and the needs of the department.

With regard to formulas for assignment and evaluation of workload, there is the suggestion that no one type will fit all departments and, thus, this has to be worked out separately for each institution. It is recognized, for instance, that the research institution may wish to weight research more heavily than teaching whereas the community college might do the reverse. In some cases, each department may have to determine its own formula as disciplines have different demands and requirements.

While the works consulted provide useful information about faculty workload, much more research is needed in this area. Many of the surveys or studies are based on self report (e.g., Blackburn et al, 1991;Boyer, 1990 of what faculty do or their sentiments regarding their work). There is a need for more qualitative types of studies which will provide additional sources of information and use multi-methods to describe faculty workload. This could involve prolonged observation, in-depth interviews with faculty and other key persons familiar with their work patterns, and content/document analysis. The Kremer study which was based on the ratings of peers (who were knowledgeable in evaluative criteria and experienced in making personnel decisions) is a step in this direction because it is a source other than self-report and provides input about faculty work. The McLaughlin et al (1983) study of assigned instructional load of men and women could be considered a type of content analysis in that it looked at schedules in terms of didactic hours and weighted student credit hours. Although this kind off analysis provides useful information, it is still only partial information because it does not consider total workload (e.g., time outside class with students).

In general, more comprehensive studies or qualitative studies would complement the quantitative work already done and serve to validate the information obtained through self-report. This has been a major criticism of the work on faculty workload as pointed out by Yuker (1984). For example, the case study conducted by Diodato (1983) offers valuable information but would be stronger if the information regarding hours spent in the three areas could be triangulated with data from sources other than self-report.

In addition, more studies, both quantitative and qualitative, could be conducted to investigate a variety of other aspects related to faculty work. For instance, more studies could be carried out to determine 1) the correlation between workload and experience or seniority; 2) the attitude of faculty regarding factors to be included in formulas for assignment/evaluation; 3) the comparability of workload of different departments or disciplines; 4) the variation of workload within a single department;

and 5) the differences in workload due to class size and types of assignment (Yuker has pointed to the need for further research in this area). Longitudinal studies of the application of certain workload formulas in assigning and evaluating faculty work would also be of great benefit as they would show how well they are functioning and if any type of skewed patterns result.

APPLYING SUGGESTIONS FROM THE LITERATURE ON WORKLOAD TO THE HUMANITIES DIVISION

The Workload/Evaluation Situation at The College of The Bahamas

The assignment of teaching load at The College of The Bahamas (COB) is based primarily on contact hours with students. In order to comply with the workload policy, which states that the maximum number of teaching hours should be sixteen (16), the chairperson assigns lecturers (with the exception of coordinators who may have 10-12 hours) three or four courses. The concern is mainly to ensure that each course has a lecturer. Little consideration is given to the level of the course, the number of students likely to enroll, or the potential marking load at the time of assignments.

In the preparation of the teaching timetable, the overall distribution of work is seldom given top priority. Rather there seems to be more of a concern for fitting names into slots. At times courses are assigned to suit the convenience of the lecturer (in terms of suitable hours) rather than to satisfy the demands of a particular course. Since individual departments in the division help to arrange teaching schedules, there is no attempt to ensure that work has been distributed equitably within a particular department or across departments.

The result of the present approach to assignment of work is a considerable disparity in workload. For instance, Lecturer A in English has sixteen (16) hours of composition courses (2 X ENG119 & 2 x ENG120) with 80-90 students and an average of 240 essays and 240 comprehension to be graded each semester. In contrast, Lecturer B in Art or Lecturer C in Music has 15 or 16 contact hours with 30 students in total and far fewer papers to grade. In some instances Lecturer B carries out a completely different kind of assessment of student work and is certainly not forced to mark into the wee hours of the night.

At the time of evaluation, lecturers such as Lecturer A are deemed to have fulfilled normal teaching duties but the question is asked "What have you done besides teaching?" Throughout the semester, Lecturer A has had a heavy marking load, constant work during office hours but little of this is visible to the public. On the

other hand, Lecturers B and C are much more visible with their art exhibitions and music recitals, work which directly emanates from class work, in some instances.

The COB evaluation, even in its present form still seems to favour work which goes beyond teaching. Even if Lecturer A has 80 students, marks hundreds of essays, sees tens of students during office hours, crossmoderates scores of papers during the semester and at the time of examinations but is unable to become involved in activities/projects outside the division or complete a piece of research, he/she could be at a disadvantage.

Suggestions from the literature on faculty workload can help to improve the assignment and evaluation of workload in the Humanities Division in a number of ways. First, the idea of creativity/individual contracts would involve faculty in the negotiation of workload assignment and the subsequent evaluation of their work. This means that there could be several different configurations of workload patterns instead of the usual 60% for teaching, 20% for service to the college and 20% for research or professional service to the community. (Although these percentages have been removed in the revised evaluation scheme, there is still an implicit expectation that faculty will perform in all three areas). In the case of the English lecturers, for example, where teaching loads tend to be very heavy, perhaps teaching could be weighted at 80% and the remaining 20% negotiated according to the strengths and interests of faculty. This could compensate those who are teaching four (or even five) courses more adequately and in this way they would not be expected to perform in all three areas. On the other hand, other lecturers (e.g. in Art and Music) might wish to be weighted 50% for teaching 20% for service to the college and 30% for research/ professional. All of this would be possible as long as all the work of the division (e.g., courses to be taught) can be completed.

Moreover, the administration would have to be persuaded that assignment and evaluation of workload need not be identical for all divisions. A workload formula which allocates 80% to teaching should be easily justifiable in a college whose primary mission is teaching. There is nothing wrong with lecturers who opt to be "Teachers" (Kremer,1991). They should be recognized and rewarded for excellent performance of duties. However, the "All Stars" (and there will always be some of these) should perhaps be considered in a special way as they may also be excellent "Teachers" but would have done much more. In the final analysis, it should be accepted that lecturers may wish to concentrate their energies in a given area in a particular year and thus they need not be placed in the same mould.

Second, there is a need for a more comprehensive workload formula and more flexibility in assigning and evaluating faculty. Workload assignments should take factors such as type of course, number of preparations, class size and type of

assignments given and so on into account. At present, workload assignment is based mainly on the number of contact hours though the number of preparations is considered at times. Looking at additional factors means that a person teaching a course for the first time who has heavy marking could be given extra consideration both at the time of assignment and during evaluation. This means that the chairperson will have to use a formula that includes a factor for number of students, potential marking load (e.g. for English Literature and Linguistic courses) difficulty level of a course and so on. Upon completion of the teaching schedule, the chairperson then needs to check the workloads within a department and across departments to ensure that there is a more or less equitable distribution of work. A chart showing the distribution of work along with pertinent factors would be quite useful for this purpose. Not only will this approach reduce the number of complaints (at the time of evaluation) that Lecturer X was able to do more in the non teaching areas because he/she had less teaching related work, but it will also lead to a fairer assessment of all that a faculty member does. This is especially important in the case of a new lecturer.

Third, research will be encouraged. The time spent on various courses and other duties will be documented or assessed in a variety of ways. This could be done through questionnaire, interview and observation. Faculty could be asked to use portfolios in a given year in order to determine how useful this could be in assessing workload during the evaluation process. Finally, faculty who are very concerned about the problem and who are interested in research, could be asked to do research on workload in the division as a special project. Another project could be longitudinal and assess the success of using individual contracts in the assignment and evaluation of workload.

REFERENCES

1. BLACKBURN,R., Lawrence,J., Bieber,J. & Trauvetter,L.(1991). Faculty at work:Focus on teaching. Research in Higher Education,32(4), 363-379.

2. BOYER,E.L.(1990). Scholarship Reconsidered. Princeton, New Jersey:The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

3. COMBS,L.L. (1986). Workload, evaluation and raises. Proceedings of Faculty Evaluation and Development: Lessons Learned (Vol.22,pp.208-217). Kansas State University:Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

4. DIODATO,V.(1983).Faculty workload: A case study. Journal of Education for Librarianship,23,286-295.

5. HAMMONS & Schade(1983). A museum piece: Faculty workload by credit hours. Community and Junior College Journal,54, 37-39.

6. HAUCK,G.F.(1969). Estimating workload. Engineering Education,60, 117-119.

7. HILL,A.J.(1969). Measuring faculty workload. Engineering Education,60,92-96.

8. KREMER,J.(1991). Identifying faculty types using peer ratings of teaching, research and service. Research in Higher Education, 32(4),351-361.

9. LEIGH,F.A. & Anderson, D.A.(1992). A balance of study and teaching in tenure and promotion cases. Journalism Educator,47(1),74-79.

10. MAGNUSEN,K.O.(1987). Faculty evaluation, performance and pay. Journal of Higher education,58(5), 516-529.

11. MANCING,H.(1991). Teaching, research, service: The concept of faculty workload. ADFL Bulletin,22(3),44-50.

12. McLAUGHLIN,G.W., Mahan,B.T. & Montgomery,J.R.(1983). Equity among assistant professors in instructional workload. Research in Higher Education,18(2),131-143.

13. MOONEY,C.J.(1992a). Critics within and without academe assail professors at research universities. Chronicle of Higher Education,39(10),pp.17-19.

14. MOONEY,C.J.(1992b). Syracuse seeks a balance between teaching and research. Chronicle of Higher Education,
38(29),pp.14-16.

15. MOONEY,C.J.(1992c). Syracuse tries to involve others in teaching vs research debate. Chronicle of Higher Education,38(29),pp.16.

16. MORROW,R.D.(1990). Faculty workload policies in schools of education: Emerging questions. Teacher Education Quarterly,17(3),53-58.

17. SAVOIE,M.J. & Sawyerr,O.O.(1991). Faculty promotions and tenure decisions: A proposed model. Journal of Education for Business,66(5),278-282.

18. SELDIN,P.(1980). Successful faculty evaluation programs. Crugers, New York: Coventry Press.

19. SODERBERG,L.O.(1985). Dominance of research and publication: An unrelenting tyranny. College teaching,33(4),168-172.

20. WATKINS,B.(1990). New technique tested to evaluate college teaching. Chronicle of Higher Education,36,pp.15-17.

21. WINKLER,A.M.(1992). The faculty workload question. Change,24(4),36-41.

22. YUKER,H.E.(1984). Faculty workload: Research, theory and interpretation. Washington, D.C. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No.10).

AUTHOR

Dr. Rhonda Chipman-Johnson is a Senior Lecturer in French and Spanish at The College of The Bahamas. She is a former Chairperson of the Humanities Division and has taught for the past twenty years.

She holds a B.A. (Hons) in French and Spanish, a B.Ed in French and Spanish, a M.Ed in Second Language Education and a Ph.D in Foreign Language Education.

She is actively involved in a number of professional and Civic organizations and has made presentations on aspects of the teaching of foreign languages and the nature of Bahamian Dialect.