

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

MEMORANDUM

To: Fort Wayne Senate

From: Faculty Affairs Committee

Mary Helen Thuente, chair

Subj: Report on Review of **SD 93-9: Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards**

Date: March 26, 1997

At the 12/9/96 Senate meeting the Faculty Affairs Committee was charged to prepare a report assessing "the faculty development impact and faculty satisfaction" with **SD 93-9: Faculty Roles, Workloads, and Rewards**. The following report is based on: (1) discussion at two open faculty meetings which were each attended by between 20 and 25 faculty; (2) interviews with 26 faculty without a research reduction and with a randomly selected group of 26 faculty with a research reduction; and (3) numerical and written responses from approximately 40% of the faculty to a survey sent to all IPFW faculty [see attached [table](#) of numerical survey data giving responses to ten major survey questions] table of numerical survey data giving responses to ten major survey questions]. The policy review has stimulated healthy dialogue about the nature and assessment of faculty work.

Responses from the faculty meetings, interviews, and surveys indicate that a significant amount of confusion and misunderstanding about the origin, nature, meaning, purpose, and impact of the policy exists among faculty without regard to their workloads. The two dimensions of the policy that generated the most comments were:

1. The right of tenured faculty to choose and move between different workloads, and the impact of those choices on campus climate. While faculty frequently praised the flexibility to choose, they also cited problems (see below) they associate with having two categories of faculty.
2. Its apparent guarantee of a fair increment for faculty without a research reduction: "All faculty shall be treated on an equal basis in salary review. To ensure this behavior, the average merit increases for Option 1 and Option 2 Faculty shall be administratively equalized." While the majority of respondents evidently liked this apparent guarantee of fairness, there was widespread confusion about what this meant and how and if it has been implemented.

Data

See attached table for a summary of numerical data from the survey. Exact data about the impact of the policy in regard to teaching productivity was not available; however, it appears that the number of faculty (mostly in A&S) who selected not to accept the research reduction and taught an additional course was offset by the number of faculty (mostly in Engineering and Technology programs and in Health Sciences) who chose the research reduction. In addition, the committee prepared the following profile of the IPFW faculty who have not chosen the research reduction:

Total: 32 (seven are in the process or very near retiring)

Rank and degree:

Assistant Professor: 9 (4 master's level, 5 doctoral)

Associate Professor: 19 (6 master's level, 13 doctoral)

Professor 4 (1 master's level, 3 doctoral)

School:

A&S 12

ETCS 14 (9 in technology programs)

BMS 0

EDUC 1

FINE ARTS 2

HEALTH SCI 2

SPEA 1

Summary of Faculty Comments from Meetings, Interviews and Surveys

Positive aspects of policy: The most frequently cited positive aspects were fairer treatment of faculty not choosing the research reduction regarding salary and the flexibility of the option to choose. Other positive aspects cited included: enhanced accountability; opening up the issue of workload for discussion; revising the notion of IPFW as a research institution.

Negative aspects of policy: The most frequently cited negative aspect by all respondents was the division of the faculty into two labeled groups with faculty not electing the research reduction seen as having second-class status (although nothing in the policy implies such a status). Some faculty felt the policy diminishes the importance of research, others felt that it diminishes teaching. A significant number of faculty also pointed out (1) how the policy limits the power of department chairs in regard to a faculty member's professional performance and contribution to

the good and welfare of the department; (2) the confusion about the meaning and implementation of the policy. A considerable number of faculty, some with, some without the research reduction, mentioned (1) not all faculty with the research reduction were productive enough in research to earn their course reduction; (2) the guarantee that salaries would be "administratively equalized" was neither possible nor

fair to faculty with the research reduction. Faculty also expressed concern in regard to the promotability of faculty without the research reduction who are assistant or associate professors and in regard to the present confusion about the difference between such faculty and instructors with master's degrees. Survey data and comments, as well as common sense, suggest that faculty teaching four courses will most likely find it difficult to compile a research record sufficient to demonstrate competence in research.

Interpretation of Data and Faculty Comments

1. **Faculty development impact resulting from policy:** The committee notes the professional development of faculty who received the research reduction and, as a result, for the first time had a course reduction. The faculty without a research reduction whom we interviewed did not address the issue of how this choice has affected their professional development.
2. **Faculty satisfaction with this policy:** Given the confusion that exists about the meaning, purpose, and impact of the policy, it is difficult to assess satisfaction. We note that faculty who have made a change in their status as a result of the policy are more likely to express satisfaction with it than those who have not made a change-and the latter are obviously in the majority.

Recommendations

After lengthy review and discussion of the information garnered from faculty meetings, interviews, and surveys, and recognizing the problems with the policy cited by the faculty, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that:

1. The present policy ([SD 93-9](#)), as amended in the document accompanying this report, continue until replaced by a new faculty workload policy, developed with ample opportunities for faculty input, that recognizes that faculty contribute to the university in different ways.
2. The Senate charge the 1997-1998 Faculty Affairs Committee to prepare a more appropriate alternative policy based on an expanded and more flexible faculty workload model that would (1) address the problems identified above with the present workload policy; (2) recognize the dignity and worth of all faculty and the range and diversity of faculty work; (3) recognize that the quality, significance, and impact of faculty work are more important than the category to which the work belongs, and (4) ensure that annual salary increments are determined in a way that takes into account the faculty member's total contribution in teaching, research, and service. The Faculty Affairs Committee should report to the Senate at its December meeting with recommendations or a progress report.