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Study Purpose

- To gather workload, job satisfaction, and quality of life information from CSU faculty with at least a 50% teaching workload.
  - Phase I gathered information on:
    - Daily workload and workload distribution (24-hour recall method)
    - Perception of workload effects on quality of life
    - Perception of control over workload
  - Phase II gathered information on:
    - Estimated workload and workload distribution over an entire academic year
    - Quality of life and control over workload (identical to Phase I)
    - Job satisfaction (work community, impact of teaching, etc.)
    - Sleep and exercise habits
- IRB Exempt Approval Protocol #19-004 and #19-068
Survey Instruments

• SurveyMonkey
  • Phase I
    • 10-questions
    • Started on October 15th, 2018
    • Ended on April 15th, 2019
    • 26 weeks
  • Phase II
    • 27-questions
    • April 15th to May 15th, 2019
• IRB Informed Consent
• Anonymous
• Average time spent on the survey
  • 5 minutes 38 seconds (Phase I)
  • 8 minutes 37 seconds (Phase II)
Faculty Database

- Excel database of 283 unique CSU faculty
  - Full time faculty with at least a 50% teaching load
  - Email address, college, and rank
    - COA (n=56), TCOB (n=49), COEHP (n=62), COLS (n=111), Library (n=4)
    - Lecturer (n=25), Assistant Professor (n=99), Associate Professor (n=77), Professor (n=82)
Email Invitations

Phase I

- Daily emails, 10/15/2018-4/14/2019
- Randomly selected from Excel database (RANDBETWEEN function)
- 3 emails per day for the first 17 days
- 4 emails per day for the next 61 days
- 6 emails per day for the remainder of the project
- 887 emails over 182 days
- Randomly selected email addresses compared favorably to database distribution.

![Bar chart of Faculty Database by College](chart1.png)

- COA: 19.79%
- TCOB: 17.31%
- COEHP: 21.91%
- COLS: 39.58%

![Bar chart of Emails Sent by College Percent of Total](chart2.png)

- COA: 19.88%
- TCOB: 16.49%
- COEHP: 23.04%
- COLS: 40.58%
Email Invitations

- Daily emails, 10/15/2018-4/14/2019
- Randomly selected from Excel database (RANDBETWEEN function)
- 3 emails per day for the first 17 days
- 4 emails per day for the next 61 days
- 6 emails per day for the remainder of the project
- 887 emails over 182 days
- Randomly selected email addresses compared favorably to database distribution.

**Phase I**
Days Captured\textsuperscript{Phase I}

- Days captured during the study
  - Mondays 81%  
    - 22 of 27
  - Tuesdays 81%  
    - 21 of 26
  - Wednesdays 81%  
    - 21 of 26
  - Thursdays 65%  
    - 17 of 26
  - Fridays 38%  
    - 10 of 26
  - Saturdays 62%  
    - 16 of 26
  - Sundays 73%  
    - 19 of 26
Phase II participants closely matched the distribution of faculty by academic rank in the database.

Phase II data is skewed by overrepresentation in COLS and underrepresentation in TCOB and COEHP.
Phase I workload data is based on 197 unique responses from 26 weeks of random resampling of the same database. It does not represent 197 unique faculty members.
### Results

#### Phase I

**Hours Worked (All Respondents)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week (days captured over the 26-week project)</th>
<th>Mean Hours Worked (on campus)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Hours Worked (off campus)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Total Hours Worked</th>
<th>Median Total Hours Worked</th>
<th>Mean Percent Off-Campus/On-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday (22 of 27)</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>68%/32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday (21 of 26)</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>76%/24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday (21 of 26)</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>72%/28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday (17 of 26)</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>66%/34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday (10 of 26)</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>70%/30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday (16 of 26)</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>62%/38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday (19 of 26)</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>66%/34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase I data indicate a typical Monday-Friday workday is approximately 7 hours on-campus and 3 hours off-campus for many CSU faculty. Weekend work, both on-campus and off-campus, may account for >20% of weekly workload.
Results Phase II

Distribution of Work: On-Campus vs. Off-Campus

Phase II data suggest one-third of all faculty work occurs off-campus.

Phase II on-campus/off-campus distribution data is consistent with data gathered in Phase I.
Results

Phase II

Probability of Weekend Work

95% of all Phase I respondents reported working on the weekend both on-campus and off-campus – consistent with Phase II data.

Median = 90%
Mean = 80%

N=79
28% of faculty
Results

Phase II

Self-Reported Workload (Hours Per Week)

Both Phase I and Phase II data suggest the majority of CSU faculty work in excess of 50 hours each week. Half of all faculty reported an average work week exceeding 55 hours.
Results 

**Phase II**

Self-Reported Workload (Hours Per Week)

Mean hours worked per week is extremely consistent across every academic rank and for teaching faculty in administrative roles.
Results

Phase I and Phase II

Distribution of Workload

Phase I and Phase II data are remarkably consistent with one another with respect to distribution of workload across 4 categories.

Phase I and II

Distribution of Workload

Phase I and II

Instruction and Related Activities
Percent On-Campus (solid bar) and Off-Campus (open bar)

Phase II = 54%

Phase I and II

Non-Instructional Student Support
Percent On-Campus (solid bar) and Off-Campus (open bar)

Phase II = 12%

Phase I and II

Scholarship and Creative Activities
Percent On-Campus (solid bar) and Off-Campus (open bar)

Phase II = 12%

Phase I and II

Service and Administrative Duties
Percent On-Campus (solid bar) and Off-Campus (open bar)

Phase II = 20%
Phase I and Phase II results are reasonably consistent with one another on the issue of perception of control over workload (all respondents) both during (Phase I) and at the end of (Phase II) the academic year.
Results \textit{Phase I and Phase II}

\textbf{Perceived Control over Workload}

\textbf{Phase I Data}

- **Assistant Professors**
  - Mean = 3.3
  - n=29
  - 29% by rank

- **Associate Professors**
  - Mean = 4.0
  - n=26
  - 34% by rank

- **Professors**
  - Mean = 4.5
  - n=23
  - 28% by rank

\textbf{Phase II Data}

- **Assistant Professors**
  - Mean = 4.3
  - n=29
  - 29% by rank

- **Associate Professors**
  - Mean = 3.5
  - n=26
  - 34% by rank

- **Professors**
  - Mean = 4.7
  - n=23
  - 28% by rank

In contrast to the faculty as a whole, analysis of faculty subcategories suggest perceptions of control over workload varies both by group and over the academic year.
Results $^\text{Phase I and Phase II}$

Perceived Control over Workload

In contrast to the faculty as a whole, analysis of faculty subcategories suggest perceptions of control over workload varies both by group and over the academic year.
Results
Phase I and Phase II
Effects of Workload on Quality of Life

Phase I and Phase II results show an increase in negative feelings about the effects of workload on quality of life over the course of the academic year for every subcategory of faculty.
Results

Phase I and Phase II

Effects of Workload on Quality of Life

Phase I Data

Phase II Data

Phase I and Phase II results show an increase in negative feelings about the effects of workload on quality of life over the course of the academic year for every subcategory of faculty.
Results

Phase I and Phase II

Effects of Workload on Quality of Life

Phase I Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Negative Effect</th>
<th>Positive Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase II Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Negative Effect</th>
<th>Positive Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase I and Phase II results show an increase in negative feelings about the effects of workload on quality of life over the course of the academic year for every subcategory of faculty.
**Results**

**Phase II**

**My Teaching and Research-Creative Endeavors Matters**

Phase II data indicate faculty have strong positive feelings about the impact of their teaching, while the majority have strong positive feelings about their research and creative activities.
Results

Phase II

Sense of Community at Work

Phase II data indicates faculty have strong positive feelings about their sense of community at work.
Phase II data indicate faculty are generally happy with expectations of non-instructional student support, but struggle with other aspects of their workload.
**Results**

**Phase II**

*Likely to Seek Employment Elsewhere*

Phase II data suggest many faculty plan to seek employment elsewhere in the immediate future. The likelihood of seeking employment systematically varies with academic rank and administrative role.
Results\textsuperscript{Phase II}

Sleep and Exercise During the Academic Year

Phase II data suggest fewer than one-third of all faculty get adequate sleep, while less than half get adequate exercise.
Summary of Workload Data

• Phase I and II results are reasonably consistent with one another in terms of hours worked per week and distribution of workload.

• Both datasets suggest the “average” faculty member works 50-60 hours per week (64% of respondents, Phase II data).

• Approximately two-thirds of workload is devoted to instruction (and related activities) and non-instructional student support.

• Approximately one-third of faculty work occurs off-campus.

• The overwhelming majority of faculty work on the weekend.

• Phase I data suggests weekend work may make up more than 20% of faculty workload.
Summary of Workload Data (continued)

• The majority of CSU faculty feel they have limited control over their workload and that workload has a significant negative impact on their quality of life.

• CSU faculty have strong positive feelings about the impacts of their teaching, research, and creative activities, as well as a strong sense of community at work.

• A strong majority of CSU faculty have concerns over expectations surrounding teaching and research/creative activities.

• A majority of CSU faculty expressed an intent to seek employment elsewhere. This intent was strongest among Assistant Professors and decreased systematically with academic rank and administrative role.

• Although slightly more than half of CSU faculty don’t get adequate exercise, a significant majority fail to get adequate sleep.