

8-2017

Factors Used to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community Colleges

Mandel G. Samuels
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>



Part of the [Community College Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Citation

Samuels, M. G. (2017). Factors Used to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community Colleges. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/2425>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, uarepos@uark.edu.

Factors Used to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community Colleges

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Higher Education

by

Mandel G. Samuels
Oklahoma State University
Bachelor of Arts in Radio-TV-Film, 1982
University of Arkansas
Master of Business Administration, 2004

August 2017
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Dr. James O. Hammons
Dissertation Director

Dr. Michael Stephen Hevel
Committee Member

Dr. Barbara A. Lofton
Committee Member

ABSTRACT

As the complexities of the departmental chair continued to increase, so did the importance of having a process to use to fairly assign the teaching load for departmental chairs. In 1982 Carolyn Branch conducted a survey to identify the factors that were being used. She received input from the chief academic officers that a process, procedure or formula was needed (Branch, 1982). The factors identified in Branch's research did not lead to the development of a process for chief academic officers to use.

There has been no published research on this topic since Branch's research in 1982. Therefore, I decided to undertake this study with the purpose of determining what factors were being used to determine the teaching load and if weights were assigned to the factors. The target population for this research was the 982 public community colleges listed on the web-site of the American Association of Community Colleges. From this list, a stratified random sample was drawn resulting in a sample population of 375 public community colleges. A survey was sent out to the sample population via electronic e-mail. Completed surveys were submitted via the Qualtrics software. The survey results were downloaded from Qualtrics into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) analytical software to analyze, synthesize, and run descriptive statistical data on the results.

The results indicated that eight of the ten factors identified by Branch in 1982 were still in use. Additional factors were reported via written text by the sample population. Just like in 1982, the chief academic officers are no closer to developing a formula to use for guidance. However, by a considerable percentage, three factors were identified and being used by a large majority of the respondents in the survey. Additionally, there were three reasons reported as being the top three reasons for making changes to the factors used to determine the teaching

load. Based on the information provided, a recommendation for improved practice and several recommendations for future research are presented.

©2017 by Mandel G. Samuels
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the semesters of completing the classwork in a doctoral program and throughout the dissertation process, numerous individuals have contributed their time, knowledge, skills, enthusiasm, motivational talks, constructive criticisms, and emotional support. My acknowledgements of their contributions are as follows:

From our first meeting Dr. James O. Hammons you were a strong encourager and supporter. You encouraged me to enter the doctoral program and became my advisor, mentor, and dissertation chair. Thank you Dr. Hammons for challenging me to use higher order thinking skills while taking my thought processes to the next level, for the many meetings we had where you encouraged me not to give up, and for the numerous hours spent on reading my drafts and providing constructive feedback. You always shared with me what I needed to hear. Your feedback improved my writing and understanding of how community colleges operate. I will forever value your experience, wisdom, knowledge, time, and the friendship that has developed.

To my other committee members, Dr. Michael S. Hevel and Dr. Barbara A. Lofton, thanks for agreeing to serve on my committee and taking the time to read my drafts, keep me on task, and encourage me throughout the dissertation process. Both of you consistently checked on my progress, held me accountable, and were always willing to help, offer guidance, and words of encouragement. I thank and appreciate you both for your contribution to the completion of this dissertation.

Dr. Ketevan “Kate” Mamiseishvili, my professor and departmental chair. You have been a fountain of support and encouragement. In addition to supporting me in completing my classes and the dissertation, you have been instrumental in acclimating me to the way academia

functions in higher education. You were always willing to talk, give me advice, and offer your assistance in classes, program coordination, and/or the dissertation process.

To Dr. John Murry Jr., your professional support in classes, as a fellow administrator, and as a friend has been invaluable. I thank you for the words of encouragement and advice on navigating through the doctoral program.

Dr. Wen-Jou Lo, thank you for the knowledge and skills you shared in your statistics course and your willingness to assist me with my data.

I want to thank Ling Ting for her assistance in guiding me through the process of entering the survey into Qualtrics and setting up the distribution lists. You were instrumental in obtaining valid results that could be used for this dissertation.

Many thanks go to Jill Berta who was instrumental in reading, analyzing, and making the results in SPSS readable and understandable.

Thanks to Dr. Tom Smith and Dr. Michael T. Miller for the opportunity work in the College of Education and Health Professions and for the continued encouragement to enter and complete a doctoral program. Your offers to serve on my committee, provide guidance, and hold me accountable for finishing the program is greatly appreciated.

DEDICATION

To the most important person in my life, my wife Lor.Raine, you are my love, my joy, and my inspiration. I appreciate your words of encouragement, selfless support, and patience. You never complained about events I had to miss in order to study, conduct research, or write. Hopefully I can make it up to you. I love you more than words can express.

To my family and friends, thanks for always being there, instilling confidence, and never giving up on me. I know Mama, Daddy, and Linda are looking down on this moment with pride.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	5
Definitions	6
Assumptions	8
Delimitations	8
Significance of the Study	8
Summary of Chapter	9
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature	10
Introduction	10
Scope of the Review.....	10
The Growth in Responsibilities of the Chair Position.....	12
Challenges of the Position.....	14
Previous Research on Factors That May Have Been Considered When Determining the Teaching Load for Chairs	15
Summary	18
Chapter Three: Methods	20
Introduction	20
Research Design	20
Population and Sample.....	21
Data Analysis	23

Summary	23
Chapter Four: Results	24
Introduction	24
Purpose of the Study	24
Significance of the Study	24
Results from the Survey	25
Summary	41
Chapter Five: Overview, Findings, Conclusions, Limitations, Recommendations, and Concluding Remarks	42
Overview of the Study.....	42
Discussion of the Findings	44
Conclusions	47
Limitations of the Study.....	49
Recommendations for Future Research	50
Recommendations for Improved Practice	51
Proposed Framework for Determining the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community	
Colleges.....	52
Rationale	52
Suggested Procedure for Institutions to Follow in Developing a Plan to Assign a Teaching	
Load for Chairs	53
Sample Worksheet for Calculating the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community	
Colleges.....	54
Concluding Remarks	56

References	57
Appendices	60
Appendix A: Written Policies Provided by Respondents	60
Appendix B: Survey	66
Appendix C: First Letter Sent to Sample Population	70
Appendix D: Second Letter Sent to Sample Population	72
Appendix E: Final Letter Sent to Sample Population	73
Appendix F: IRB Approval Letter	74
Appendix G: IRB Project Modification Approval Letter.....	75

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The idea of community colleges began in the latter half of the 19th century when influential educators spoke in favor of establishing two-year institutions (Gabert & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991). The growing emphasis on science and technology and the urgency to train workers motivated the desire to create two-year institutions that provided a liberal arts education along with vocational teachings that were at the college level (Phillipe, Sullivan, & American Association of Community Colleges, 2005). Initially, these two-year institutions were referred to as junior colleges. The first junior colleges established in the United States (U.S.) were actually an extension of high schools (Gabert & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991). In 1901, the school board in the Joliet Township in Illinois gave permission to the high school to offer post-graduate courses (Scibelli, 2001). J. Stanley Brown, the principal of the public high school in Joliet, Illinois, “created Joliet Junior College by adding a fifth and sixth year of courses to the high school curriculum” (Phillippe, Patton, & American Association of Community Colleges W. National Profile of Community Colleges, 2000, p. 17) and convincing the university professors to give credit to the students who were successful in completing the courses (Phillippe et al., 2000). Scibelli (2001) states that “the courses were so well attended that in 1916 the post-graduate division was formally named Joliet Junior College” (p. 1). “In addition to offering credit and noncredit courses to a broad constituency, many community colleges serve as cultural, social, and intellectual hubs in their communities” (Vaughan & American Association of Community Colleges, 2006, p. 1). The success of the two-year institutions was due to the courses offered being geared toward the needs of the community (Scibelli, 2001) which led to the rapid growth in the opening of junior colleges.

In 1909, there was a growth spurt of junior colleges in California when the state legislature decided to assist in funding the efforts of the high schools' to provide the first two years of college courses (Phillippe et al., 2000). By 1910, 5% of 18-year-old Americans were enrolling in higher education due to the popularity of this new education model (Phillippe et al., 2005). During the 1930s more than 300 private and 200 public two-year institutions across the country offered education programs including job training (Phillippe et al., 2005). In 1948, the Truman Commission proposed the formation of a system of public, two-year colleges to serve the needs of the local community (Phillippe et al., 2000). The community college serves the needs of the local community through its mission to provide access to services and postsecondary educational programs that contribute to a stronger and invigorating community (Vaughan & American Association of Community Colleges, 2006). One of the local community needs was assisting those in poverty. Junior colleges became an important part of the war on poverty as part of President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society (Scibelli, 2001). Other services such as occupational-technical programs, employee training, support services, developmental education, and college transfer programs (Vaughan & American Association of Community Colleges, 2006) aided in the growth of community colleges.

In the 1950s community colleges struggled as some of the independent junior colleges shut their doors or were recast into four-year institutions (Vaughan & American Association of Community Colleges, 2006). During the decade of the 1960s, 457 junior colleges opened their doors (Scibelli, 2001) which was more than the total number of junior colleges that existed prior to that decade (Phillippe et al. 2000). The decade of the 1960s also saw approximately 45% of all 18 year olds or baby boomers, the children of WWII veterans, register for entry into college (Phillippe et al., 2005).

During the next 30 years, the unprecedented growth of junior colleges continued. There were roughly 850 junior colleges in 1970, growing to more than 1,000 by 1980 with a total credit enrollment of nearly 4 million (Gabert & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991). In addition to the changes in enrollment and the number of colleges, the term used for the colleges began to evolve. According to Cohen and Brawer (2008) the terms junior college and community college were both being used during the 1950s and 1960s. In the 1970s the term, community college had become the term typically used (Cohen & Brawer, 2008) when referring to two-year institutions. The 1970s also saw a change in how the community colleges were funded. In 1978, Proposition 13 was passed in California which started the trend of the states paying a larger share of the costs for community colleges than the local government (Vaughan & American Association of Community Colleges, 2006). As of the late 1980s, approximately 430,000 associate degrees were awarded on an annual basis with 70% of the postsecondary enrollments in two-year institutions being in vocational areas (Gabert & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991). The number of credit enrollments increased to more than 5 million and 4 million in not-for-credit programs by 1990 (Gabert & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991). As of the fall 2014 semester, there were 982 public community colleges enrolling 7.3 million credit students and 5 million non-credit students accounting for 45% of all undergraduates enrolled in higher education (“American Association”, 2016 Retrieved February 17, 2016 from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/AACCFactSheetsR2.pdf>). Not only did enrollment increase during this period, the complexity of the mission of two-year colleges also increased.

Part of this complexity was due to the challenge of providing a variety of services to the communities and constituents the colleges served. Some of these services included open access

admissions, fair and equal treatment to all students, counseling, academic advising, and financial aid (Vaughan & American Association of Community Colleges, 2006). Providing these and other services will continue to be a challenge. According to Vaughan and American Association of Community Colleges (2006), community colleges will continue to face challenges such as:

- a. constraints on public funding
- b. tuition increases
- c. enrollment increases
- d. changes in technology
- e. having processes and procedures to help students persist toward their educational goals
- f. demographic changes in society
- g. and the need to serve an abundance of students who are underprepared.

In order to address these challenges, funding must be identified for the annual budget. This has become increasingly difficult as “Budgetary pressures have been heightened by taxpayers’ and legislators’ desire for proof that public money is well spent” (Phillippe et al., 2000, p. 21). These challenges continued to grow as the traditional college-age population was expected to grow to 30 million by 2016 (Hussar & Bailey, 2013).

The increase in the student population has also increased the number and complexity of administrative tasks needed to be performed by the chair. This increase in the number of administrative tasks increases the amount of time needed to perform the responsibilities of the chair position. Since the chair position, as defined later, is not considered an administrative position, the faculty accepts the responsibility of performing the administrative responsibilities of the chair position in addition to maintaining their teaching responsibilities for a finite period.

The struggle of time allotment between the administrative and the teaching responsibilities has challenged the chief academic officer in determining how to assign a teaching load for the chair.

Statement of the Problem

As community colleges began to grow, “one of the ways in which community colleges responded to the enrollment growth and subsequent increases in size and complexity was to pass some of the increasing academic administrative responsibilities to chairs, who were usually instructors who assumed these tasks in addition to their teaching load” (Kuhl, 2004, p. 31). This placed a teaching load burden upon the faculty members. The factors used and the weight given to each factor to determine the teaching load for a faculty member who agrees to perform the chair responsibilities vary widely between institutions and within colleges. Presently, there is no agreed upon process or procedure in place to guide a chief academic officer in determining the teaching load for a chair.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the factors and the weight assigned to each factor that were being used by chief academic officers to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. The intention was to identify and analyze the existing factors that were being used to determine the chairs’ teaching load in order to identify workable solutions that could be adapted by all community colleges.

Research Questions

In addition to learning about the factors being used, this study also sought information about whether or not the college used factors in determining the teaching load, the length of time the factors had been used, recent changes that had been made to the list of factors, and the satisfaction level of the chief academic officers with the factors they were using. Through the analysis of the collected data, I sought to identify workable solutions that could be adapted by

other community colleges. To achieve these purposes, the following research questions needed to be answered.

For institutions in the sample population:

1. What percent used factors, other than the number of full-time faculty, for determining the teaching load?
2. What factors were they using to determine the teaching load for the chair position?
3. How long have they been using these factors for determining the teaching load? In particular, what percent had made changes in the factors used in the last 10 years?
4. If changes had been made, what was the nature of the changes?
5. Were the chief academic officers (CAO) satisfied with their current system?

Definitions

To ensure the clarity of understanding, several terms needed to be defined. Therefore, the following definitions were applicable to this study.

Chair—As used herein, chair is the term used to refer to persons whose college might have given them any of the following titles: department chair, division chair, coordinator, director, or assistant dean. What they share in common is that they are considered to be faculty, not administrators, they continue to teach, they develop class schedules, supervise and evaluate faculty, and they develop and administer budgets for one or more departments or programs.

Community College—A comprehensive two-year institution that is regionally accredited to award, as its highest level of degree, an associate in arts or an associate in science (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). In this research study, the terms community college and two-year college were used interchangeably.

Chief Academic Officer—The person (or persons) responsible for curriculum and instruction. If the college separates transfer and occupational education, these might be two different persons. In most cases, the person(s) in this role or roles reports to the president.

Factor—A component or element of the position that requires time, is weighted, and has an influence on the workload of the chair (Branch, 1982). Examples of factors include number of full-time faculty, number of part-time faculty, budget complexity, etc. (Branch, 1982).

Single-Campus Community College—A two-year institution of higher education created via a state law or constitution, that has only one campus, operates as a non-profit tax-exempt institution, and is supported via taxes (Kinney, 2008).

Multi-Campus Community College—A two-year institution of higher education that has two or more branch campuses that are of sufficient size to warrant an independent administration (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Cohen and Brawer (2008) also state that there is a central college administration led by a chancellor or president and staffed with administrators, research coordinators, and other positions that are responsible for the overall fiscal, academic, and student services of the college. Each campus will be treated as one institution for this study.

Unit—Some chairs are responsible for one department; others a program; others a division consisting of two or more disciplines or programs. The term unit will be used where possible. When referring to others' works, I will use the term they used.

Workload—Traditionally, the higher education system in the United States has defined faculty teaching load in terms of the number of hours per week a teacher meets with a class ("American Association," 2016).

Assumptions

Chief academic officers use differing methods to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. There is little consistency in the methods used between and within the various institutions. While there are inconsistencies, there may be some similarities. The identification of these similarities may lead to workable solutions that can be used by other community colleges to determine a teaching load for chairs that will provide them with the time needed to successfully perform their administrative and teaching responsibilities.

Delimitations

- The research was de-limited to two-year single and multi-campus public community colleges in the United States.

Significance of the Study

Community colleges are an important piece of the postsecondary education system. Chairs play an important role in the success of each community college. A published study has not been conducted on the factors used to determine the teaching load for department chairs since the study completed by Carolyn Branch in 1982. An updated study may identify a process to use that allows the individual in the chair position to be successful and perform at the highest level while performing both their administrative and teaching responsibilities. This research can significantly add to the body of research if consistent policies, factors, and procedures are found to be in use by multiple institutions when deciding the teaching load for chairs. This will provide best practices and furnish guidance for public community college chief academic officers to follow.

Summary of Chapter

The changes in the economy, global competition, increased accountability, and the skillset needed to compete and be successful in today's marketplace have led to an increase in the number of people enrolling in or going back to school. The growth in the number of students and academic departments, and the complexities of operating a community college has increased the administrative workload for the chairs who also continue with their teaching responsibilities. The increase in administrative responsibilities presents a challenge to chief academic officers who seek a process for determining a fair and equitable teaching load for their chairs. At the time of this study, there was no consensus found in the literature on an approach to use for assigning a teaching load for chairs. While there may never be a single process that can be used by all two-year public institutions, the identification and sharing of successful approaches being used may help most colleges identify a fair and equitable process to use for determining an appropriate teaching load for chairs.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to present information from a review of relevant published literature about the approaches that were being used to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. The chapter is organized into the following sections: 1) the scope of the review, 2) the growth in responsibilities of the chair position, 3) the challenges of the position, 4) previous research on factors that may have been considered when determining the teaching load for chairs and 5), a summary of the chapter.

Scope of the Review

The amount of information available on departmental chairs in two-year institutions was limited since the majority of research on the chair position has been conducted at four-year institutions (Gallagher, 2003). Much of the research in the literature focuses on the stress, roles and responsibilities, and the lack of training for the individuals who have served in the chair position. Thirty-five years earlier, Carolyn Branch (1982), after conducting a comprehensive review of the literature about the community college chair position, reported “The literature information available about the workload of the division chairperson in the two-year college consists only of lists, activities, or tasks to be done and descriptive phases [*sic*] of the chairperson’s needing more time to do and to learn how to do the job more effectively” (p. 45). Sadly, I found that not much has changed since Branch’s literature review.

I conducted an exhaustive search of the literature for information on the approaches that were being used to determine the teaching load for chairs in community colleges. This search included dissertations, peer-reviewed journal articles, and other scholarly literature covering the

years from 1982 – 2016. Multiple databases were searched including Proquest, WorldCat, EBSCO, Google Scholar, and ERIC. The key words and phrases used in the searches included (college department head* or chair* or college administrator*) and thesis, department head*, chair*, community college*, community college* and (administrator* and leader*), junior college*, work*, responsibil*, assign*, duties, first community colleges, status of community colleges, and definition of load for department chairs in higher education. Various combinations of the above listed key words and phrases were used to execute the search in the multiple databases.

The search of the Proquest database resulted in 180 dissertations; the WorldCat database returned 335 articles; the EBSCO database returned 548 articles; Google Scholar resulted in 16,202 results; and the ERIC database returned 4 articles. At the conclusion of this in-depth search a total 17,269 sources were located. The process I used to narrow the list to articles relevant to the study is described below.

I reviewed all of the abstracts of all of the documents referenced above. After evaluating the material, only a minimal number of the documents were relevant to this research. Of the 180 documents located in the Proquest database, eleven dissertations appeared to be relevant. A review of the article abstracts in the WorldCat database yielded one other apparent relevant article. The EBSCO database provided eleven articles that appeared to be pertinent to this research with five of those articles obtained through Interlibrary Loan (Illiad). Four of the articles from the search in the Google Scholar database were found to pertain to this research. The ERIC database provided four relevant articles. In total, the number of apparent relevant sources found was 31.

The search for sources in multiple databases using various descriptors did not locate any literature that directly reported on the approaches being used to determine the teaching load for chairs. However, the literature did report on things such as the workload, responsibilities of the position, role of the position, and importance of the position. This information provided some insight into what chief academic officers were considering as they determined the teaching load for chairs.

The Growth in Responsibilities of the Chair Position

In the sixties and seventies, in order to handle increasing enrollments, college administrators found it necessary to re-organize the academic part of the college into divisions or departments led by a chairperson (Branch, 1982; Branch & Hammons, 1984). This re-organization included assigning some of the dean's administrative responsibilities to a division or departmental chairperson (Branch, 1982). These additional administrative responsibilities began with tasks such as developing class schedules and ordering textbooks for classes (Branch, 1982). Branch (1982) also reported that these administrative duties were an addition to the existing teaching load of the chair. As these and other tasks were added for the chairs, the problem of not having enough time to perform the responsibilities of both the teaching and administrative positions grew.

As early as 1984 Branch and Hammons pointed out those administrative tasks, when added to existing teaching loads, often caused unreasonable demands on the chairs' time (Branch & Hammons, 1984). In 1996, Hoffman and Others reported that most community college chairs, who were also part of the faculty, were teaching over 60% of their expected workload (Hoffman & Others, 1996). Unfortunately, there was not a procedure or process in place to assist deans and vice-presidents in determining how to allocate their time between the teaching and

administrative responsibilities. To this day there is not a procedure or process in place for determining the teaching load for chairs. There has not been any subsequent research on the factors used to determine a teaching load for chairs since 1982. Smith and Stewart (1999) reported that two factors that consume a large amount of time were the constant interruptions of becoming a public figure and the amount of administrative responsibilities. The types of administrative responsibilities assigned vary widely. Some of the administrative responsibilities the chairs are assigned include leading their department or division, developing unit plans and goals, managing the unit, developing and implementing a budget, evaluating and mentoring faculty, resolving personnel issues among the staff and faculty, overseeing the academic programs, encouraging faculty and staff professional development, developing relationships with students, communicating with their unit, and maintaining their own academic scholarship (Mitchell, 2004). The chairs also have a responsibility to the faculty within their unit, to the administration of the institution, to the community, and to the students (Gallagher, 2003).

The chairs must constantly balance the responsibilities of the teaching workload against their administrative responsibilities. While chairs are struggling to devote time to the myriad of responsibilities, they must also carve out time to maintain a connection to their chosen discipline by taking part in professional development activities (Gallagher, 2003). These and other administrative responsibilities make it difficult for a chief academic officer to determine a fair and equitable teaching load for the chair. Although the administrative duties continued to increase for the chair, Grau (1997) points out that “possibly the most important yet underrated position in a community college is the department chair, the person in a position to have the most effective influence on faculty but, for most colleges, the most neglected or least integrated position in the organizational structure” (p. 3).

Challenges of the Position

There are numerous challenges an individual has to confront when accepting a position as chair. One of those challenges is knowing what your teaching workload will be. “In the American system of higher education, faculty ‘workloads’ are usually described in hours per week of formal class meetings” (American Association of University Professors, 2012, p. 191). This description does not consider additional time-consuming responsibilities for a faculty member such as expectations for advising, administrative duties, or other organizational responsibilities (American Association of University Professors, 2012). Based on research by Branch (1982), in 1981 there was no systematic method in use to determine the teaching load for chairs. Branch (1982) also reported that there was a need for a rational process to determine the administrative and teaching loads for chairs. This has become increasingly important as the chair position has gained recognition as the key management position in community colleges (Gmelch & Burns, 1994).

Being in a key position puts pressure on the chair to find a way to daily strike a balance between the many choices that must be made. The choice is often between spending time with family, spending time on leisurely activities, spending time on professional development, or spending time on work related activities. Some of these work related events require the attention of the chair outside of the normal workday. “Many important academic activities are pursued outside the normal eight-to-five working hours and away from the departmental office” (Mancing, 1994, p. 32). Due to the number of work related activities, the chair is often challenged to make choices between professional and personal activities. When you consider the teaching load, and the administrative and additional responsibilities, the time commitment needed is often more than a standard 40 hour work week. This emphasizes the importance of

having a system to determine the teaching load for chairs. These challenges are important for faculty to consider as they contemplate whether or not to serve in a chair position.

Previous Research on Factors That May Have Been Considered When Determining the Teaching Load for Chairs

After observing faculty performance and workloads for many years, the American Association of University Professors (2012) suggests “a teaching load of twelve hours per week, with no more than six separate course preparations during the academic year” (p. 192) for faculty teaching undergraduate courses. The twelve hours per week is typically defined as four courses worth three credit hours each for a total of 12 hours. This teaching load is based on the faculty member not having any expectations of performing counseling, research, administration, or other organizational responsibilities (“American Association,” 2012). However, this suggestion is not usually adhered to in community colleges. “American Association” (2012) goes on to state that community colleges have usually exceeded the recommended twelve-hour undergraduate instruction maximum. Not only has the teaching load recommendation been exceeded for faculty, chairs are also being asked to teach more than the recommended load in addition to the administrative responsibilities. Murray and Murray (1998) found that “47.5% of the division chairpersons teach between 3 and 5 courses a term, 50.7% supervise 21 or more full-time faculty, and 52.8% supervise 21 or more part-time faculty” (p. 49). These responsibilities do not include after-hour activities that take place in the evenings and on weekends. The after-hour responsibilities are a just a few of the many factors that exert an influence on determining the teaching load for a chair. Since the 1982 study, there have not been any articles written to address the factors that are used to determine the workload for chairs.

Branch and Hammons (1984) identified ten recurring factors that were thought to influence the determination of the teaching load for departmental chairs: “(1) number of full-time faculty; (2) number of part-time faculty; (3) geographic contiguity of division personnel; (4) general curriculum and instructional duties; (5) number of advisory committees; (6) general duties related to students; (7) complexity of the budget; (8) teaching and learning aids; (9) number of non-instructional personnel; and (10) quantity of administrative duties” (p. 27). However, these may not be the only factors influencing the determination of the teaching load for chairs. Gmelch and Burns (1994) mentioned that attempting to stay current in their academic discipline, maintaining a balance between their personal and professional lives, handling personal and telephone interruptions, and attending meetings may also have an influence. Of course, the above list of factors does not include teaching responsibilities.

Some may think that the teaching responsibilities are minimal and therefore the administrative duties would not be an undue burden. Teaching is more involved than the few hours a week spent in the classroom (Mancing, 1994). Many other tasks are performed such as class preparation, meeting with the students, and evaluation which makes teaching a complicated and time consuming process (Mancing, 1994). According to Hammons (1984), over the years chairs have consistently stated that the totality of the administrative and teaching load is too much and “have asked that a more rational approach to determining chairperson workload be developed” (Hammons, 1984, p. 19).

Without a rational approach to determine the teaching load for chairs, the amount of time needed to perform the administrative duties may not be considered by the chief academic officer. With the weight of the administrative and teaching load on the chair and the finite amount of time available to perform all of the job responsibilities, “college officials cannot expect

consistent effective performance and leadership from a chairperson who has a combined administrative and teaching load which is unrealistic” (Branch, 1982, p. 3). One reason for the unrealistic demands on the community college chair may be due to the lack of research on the position since the formalization of the position during the years between 1870 and 1925 (Dyer & Miller, 1999). The lack of research about the chair position has likely contributed to the lack of preparation of a person to perform in this role.

According to Branch and Hammons (1982), a faculty member typically appointed to the chair position and asked to assume the additional administrative tasks while continuing with their teaching workload is a faculty member who has limited-to-no experience in performing administrative duties. The lack of experience can be due to a number of reasons. One of the reasons may be faculty members’ lack of opportunities to participate in training for administrative roles. In two-year institutions the department chairs usually come from faculty and are typically not provided the same development or training opportunities that are afforded to other administrators (Gallagher, 2003). Additional concerns focus on the way that chairs performance is reviewed and evaluated. Typically, chairs are not evaluated on how they perform their teaching responsibilities; they are evaluated on how well they perform their administrative responsibilities (Mitchell, 2004). Therefore, if a choice has to be made between accomplishing either a teaching or an administrative task, the teaching task is the one likely to be set aside. This is another reason why developing a rational way to determine teaching workload is important.

Developing a rational way to determine a teaching workload that does not place an undue burden of administrative and teaching responsibilities on the individual is not easy. In fact, two authors suggest a combined workload of teaching and administrative responsibilities may be too much for one individual to handle in some community colleges. “Would it be better to have CC

chairs as administrators with part-time faculty duties” (Smith & Stewart, 1999, p. 32) rather than a faculty member who is considered a half-time administrator? This is a difficult question to answer due to the many variables that must be considered for each chair position in each department at each institution. Branch and Hammons (1984) stated that each chairperson of a division has unique job elements that must be considered when attempting to decide upon an equitable teaching workload for the chair. After considering all of the challenges and choices, the solution may be that “no single formula for an equitable faculty workload can be devised for all of American higher education (“American Association,” 2012, p. 191). Even without a single formula, multiple options may be uncovered that can assist chief academic officers in determining a fair and equitable teaching load that allows the chairs adequate time to perform the administrative and teaching responsibilities while positively contributing to the success of the institution and not experiencing burnout or avoiding the opportunity to be in the chair role.

Summary

This chapter presented information from relevant published literature about the approaches used to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. As pointed out earlier, there was limited research available in the literature on departmental chairs in two-year institutions. The majority of the literature discussed the stress, role and responsibilities, and the lack of training for individuals in the chair position.

In community colleges, the largest group of administrators are the chairs who have been exalted as the key to the success of the institution’s programs (Branch & Hammons, 1984). Due to the growth in the number of students and programs, the responsibilities and importance of the position have grown. This growth has not taken into consideration what factors should be considered when determining the teaching load for the chairs. There is no specific literature that

directly reported on how the teaching load is being determined for chairs (nor is there a list of performance criteria for the chair position). Grau (1997) states that a job description that has clear job expectations should be provided when offering a person the chair position. This becomes increasingly important as the responsibilities of the position continue to grow and change and faculty members consider whether or not to accept the appointment to a chair position.

The individual who accepts the chair position will have to consider the myriad of administrative and teaching responsibilities associated with the position. The position has continuously added more responsibilities, complexity, and challenges without addressing the teaching workload. Expectations, release time, teaching load, and administrative responsibilities vary between departments, colleges, and institutions. These are just some of the challenges of balancing the administrative and teaching workload. Without a method to use for guidance in determining the teaching load, the totality of the administrative and teaching load can become overwhelming. Unfortunately, no equitable formula for determining the teaching load or a method for considering the differences can be found in the literature (Branch & Hammons, 1984). By determining a reasonable teaching workload, it should be possible for the chair to prepare for the administrative responsibilities and efficiently and effectively carry out the responsibilities of both the teaching and administrative roles (Branch & Hammons, 1984).

CHAPTER 3

Methods

Introduction

As pointed out earlier, the purpose of the study was to discover the factors being used by chief academic officers to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. A review of the literature found that the administrative responsibilities of the chair have continued to increase in community colleges throughout the years. These increases in administrative responsibilities, which were in addition to their teaching workload, resulted in inconsistency in the process of determining the teaching load for chairs. The lack of a consistent process for determining a reasonable teaching workload may be negatively affecting the performance of both the administrative and teaching responsibilities by individuals in the chair position. If workable solutions to this problem are identified by analyzing the methods being used by a representative sample of public community college chief academic officers, maybe a process for assigning the teaching load for chairs can be proposed for use by public community colleges. This chapter will discuss: the research design chosen for this research; the process used to select a representative sample from the proposed population; and the data collection and data analysis procedures.

Research Design

To achieve the purpose of this study a survey of chief academic officers was completed to ascertain the approaches being used to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. As is representative of any survey, these data represented one point in time and measured current practices and, when compared with previous data, could reveal trends (Creswell, 2008).

I developed a draft survey instrument that the dissertation advisor, who has considerable expertise on this topic, reviewed. The draft of the survey instrument was then field-tested with a group of three chief academic officers in three community colleges. All three of the community colleges were located in the state of Arkansas. These three chief academic officers were asked to complete and submit the survey and provide suggested changes to the survey. Once the results from the field-test were reviewed and appropriate changes made to the instrument, the survey was sent to the sample population.

Population and Sample

The target population for the survey consisted of the 982 public community colleges in the United States of America as listed on the web site of the American Association of Community Colleges (retrieved March 24, 2016 from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfactsfactsheet.aspx>). Private colleges and colleges with religious affiliation were not included in the target population.

The sample consisted of a stratified random sample of community colleges that was representative of the target population. To ensure a representative sample of the target population the institutions were grouped based on the number of full-time students enrolled in the fall of 2014 semester. The groupings for the number of full time students were as follows: fewer than 2500 students; 2500 – 4999 students; and 5000+ students. These groupings were based on their use in studies by Underwood & Hammons (1999) and Kinney (2008).

To achieve a 95% confidence level in the survey results with a sampling error rate of $\pm 4\%$, the researcher used the Research Advisor's sample size table to determine the number of institutions to include in the sample (The Research Advisors, 2006). The Research Advisor's table (The Research Advisors, 2006) recommended a sample size of 373, a number that was

approximately 38% of the total number of public community colleges. Once the institutions were stratified based on the number of enrolled students and accrediting association, a systematic random sample was chosen from the list of public community colleges. The stratification for the enrolled students was under 2500, 2500 to 4999, and 5000 +. Each institution was assigned a number starting with number 5. Using a random number generator, approximately 33% of the sample was chosen from each of the number of student enrollment stratifications. Based on the recommended sample size of 373, there would need to be 124.33 colleges chosen from each of the student enrollment stratifications. I chose to increase the sample size to 375. This allowed for the equal representation of colleges by choosing 125 colleges from each of the student enrollment stratifications. The steps listed below were followed with the goal of reaching a minimum response rate of 40% of the 375 colleges for e-mail surveys (Response Rates, n.d.):

1. The survey was field-tested.
2. Changes were made to the survey based on feedback from the field-test.
3. The population was stratified using the number of full time students enrolled in the institution and regional accrediting association.
4. A random sample was chosen from each of the stratifications.
5. An introductory letter was sent via e-mail to the sample population. A link to the survey was included in the introductory letter.
6. A reminder was sent out via e-mail to the sample population.
7. A final notification was sent via e-mail to the sample population. This served as a thank you and a final reminder for those who had not returned the survey.

Community college chief academic officers whose college was selected from the target population received an introductory letter, via electronic mail, informing them about the survey.

The survey was sent to the sample population via a link that was included with the introductory letter. Distributing the survey via electronic mail was an economical and efficient way to collect the data, reach a population that is dispersed geographically, and complete the data collection in a short amount of time (Creswell, 2008). The introductory letter explained the purpose of the survey, how the results could benefit their institution, asked for their participation by completing the survey within seven business days, and asked them to attach a written copy, if available, of the approaches they were using to determine the teaching load for their academic middle managers. A reminder notice was sent to the sample population via electronic mail five business days after the survey was initially sent out.

Data Analysis

To ensure the confidentiality for each community college, each survey was assigned a number. The data from the surveys were entered into a statistical software package. The statistical software package used for this research was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). After entering the data, I used descriptive statistics to conduct an analysis and synthesis of the information.

Summary

The research design chosen for this study was described; the process used to select a representative sample from the proposed population; and the data collection and data analysis procedures.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Introduction

The data for this research were collected through a survey of a representative sample of chief academic officers in public community colleges. As described in chapter three, the sample consisted of a stratified random sample of community colleges. The data from the survey of the sample population were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). After entering the data, descriptive statistics were used to analyze and synthesize the results. Following a brief review of the purpose of, and significance of the study, the results from the survey are presented followed by a summary of the chapter.

Purpose of the Study

As presented in chapter 1, the purpose of this study was to determine the factors and the weight assigned to each factor that was being used by chief academic officers to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. The intention was to identify and analyze the factors in order to identify workable solutions that could be adapted by all community colleges.

Significance of the Study

A published study has not been conducted on the factors used to determine the teaching load for department chairs since 1982, as pointed out in chapter 1. It was thought that an updated study might yield information that could be adapted by other institutions when deciding the teaching load for chairs. The original goal was to obtain a 40% response rate from all accrediting regions. Unfortunately, only 10.4% of the sample population responded to the survey (39 institutions). This low response rate resulted in the decision to use only descriptive statistics.

Results from the Survey

Data from the survey are presented below, organized in the order the questions appeared on the survey. Tables are used, where needed, to present the information from the sample population responses. For ease of understanding, tables have been numbered to match the survey questions. To maintain the confidentiality of the respondents, additional information is presented verbatim, with minor editing to ensure clarity, but without citations and references. The first question on the survey asked for the name and address of the college. To maintain confidentiality, this information was not included in the analysis.

Question 2. Which Association accredits your college?

All 39 of the participants responded to this question. The accrediting agencies for the survey were based on the information found on April 4, 2016 on the web-site for the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities was not listed as one of the choices on CHEA's web-site nor the survey. I received e-mails from colleges that did not participate in the survey because of this. The number of colleges and the percent associated with each accrediting association are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Number and Percent of Respondents by Accrediting Association

	Accrediting Associations						Total
	Western Association of Schools and Colleges	Higher Learning Commission	Middle States Commission on Higher Education	New England Association of Schools and Colleges	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	WASC Senior College and University Commission	
Number	4	15	7	5	8	0	39
Percent	10.3	38.5	17.9	12.8	20.5	0	100.0

Question 3. Does the following definition for chair align with your college’s definition of the chair position?

As used herein, chair is the term used to refer to persons whose college might have given them any of the following titles: department chair, division chair, coordinator, director, or assistant dean. What they share in common is that they are considered to primarily be faculty, not administrators, they continue to teach, they develop class schedules, supervise and evaluate faculty, and they develop and administer budgets for one or more departments or programs.

All 39 of the responding colleges reported yes.

Question 4. Title of Person Responding.

Almost 85% of respondents had the title of either Vice-President/Provost or Chief Academic Officer. Four had a title that was not a choice on the survey. The number and percent of respondents by title are listed in Table 4. Table 4a shows the number of respondents and the reported titles that were not listed as a choice on the survey.

Table 4

Number and Percent of Respondents by Title of Position

Title of Position	Number	Percent
President	1	2.6
Vice-President/Provost	21	53.8
Chief Academic Officer	12	30.8
Dean	1	2.6
Other Titles (see Table 4a)	4	10.3
Total	39	100.0

Table 4a

Number of Respondents by Titles not Listed on Survey

Title of Position Not Listed as Choice on Survey	Number
Executive Dean	1
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	2
Vice President of Academic & Community Affairs	1
Total	4

Question 5. Estimate of the median age of your current chairs?

As table 5 shows, the estimated median age of the chairs suggests that there should not be a retirement crisis when a large majority of chairs decide to retire.

Table 5

Number and Percent of Respondents by the Estimated Median Age of the Chairs

Median Age Range	Number	Percent
36-40	3	7.7
41-45	14	35.9
46-50	11	28.2
51-55	6	15.4
56-60	5	12.8
Total	39	100.0

Question 6. What approximate percentage of your chairs is male?

Both the mean and median of the percentages of chairs that were male was below 50% as shown in Table 6. In 1992, Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, and VanHorn-Grassmeyer (1994) reported that 59% of chairs in community colleges were male. The drop in the percentage of male chairs indicates increased numbers of women hired into community college leadership positions. Table 6a shows the number of colleges for each reported percentage.

Table 6

Mean and Median of Percentage of Chairs that are Male

Mean	44.10
Median	45.00

Table 6a

Number and Percentage of Chairs that are Male

Percent of chairs who are male	Number of Colleges	Percent of Total
0	3	7.7
3	1	2.6
6	1	2.6
20	1	2.6
30	2	5.1
33	1	2.6
35	1	2.6
36	1	2.6
38	1	2.6
40	5	12.8
45	5	12.8
50	5	12.8
55	1	2.6
56	1	2.6
57	1	2.6
60	4	10.3
66	1	2.6
75	2	5.1
90	1	2.6
100	1	2.6
Total	39	100.0

Question 7. What is the average number of years of service in the chair position for the current chairs on your campus?

The majority of the chairs had a minimum of 4 years of experience in the chair position while over one-third had more than 7 years of experience.

Table 7

Number and Percent of Respondents by the Average Number of Years of Service in the Chair Position for the Current Chairs on Campus

Years of Service in Chair Position	Number	Percent
0-3	4	10.3
4-7	21	53.8
8-10	8	20.5
11+	6	15.4
Total	39	100.0

Question 8. Does the teaching load remain constant from year to year?

The teaching load for chairs was consistent from year to year for almost 85% of the colleges. This suggests that the colleges were using the same factors each year when determining the teaching load.

Table 8

Number and Percent of Colleges with Consistent Teaching Load

Consistent Teaching Load From Year to Year	Number	Percent
Yes	33	84.6
No	6	15.4
Total	39	100.0

Question 9. Is the teaching load the same for all chairs?

While the overall teaching load was consistent from year to year for almost 85% of the colleges (Table 8), the teaching load for chairs was different in over 60% of the colleges (Table 9). This suggests that the colleges are using the same formula but adjusting the factors based on the situation of the individual person when determining the teaching load.

Table 9

Number and Percent of Colleges with the Same Teaching Load for all Chairs

Same Teaching Load for all Chairs	Number	Percent
Yes	15	38.5
No	24	61.5
Total	39	100.0

Question 10. What is the average number of classes taught by chairs?

As shown by Table 10, all of the respondents reported that their chairs were teaching. But as Table 10a shows, the number of classes being taught and the factors used to determine the number of classes assigned varied. Table 10b shows that despite the many factors used to determine the teaching load for chairs, both the mean and median number of classes taught was approximately four.

Table 10

Number of Classes Taught and Number and Percent of Chairs Teaching Classes

No. of Classes	Number	Percent
1	1	2.6
2	7	17.9
3	9	23.1
4	8	20.5
Other – see Table 10a	14	35.9
Total	39	100.0

Table 10a

Number of Classes Taught and Number and Percent of Chairs Whose Teaching Load was Different than the Choices Available on the Survey

No. of Classes Taught From Other Category in Table 10	Number	Percent
0-3	1	2.6
2.5	1	2.6
5	4	10.3
5 per year	1	2.6
5 to 6	1	2.6
6	1	2.6
7	1	2.6
Based upon load hours	1	2.6
Teaching load is dictated by the union contract	1	2.6
Varies according to a formula	1	2.6
Would be 4 but they elect to teach overload	1	2.6
Total	14	36.3

Table 10b

The Mean and Median of the Number of Classes Taught by Chairs

	Mean	Median
What is the average number of classes taught by chairs?	3.69	4.00

Question 11. Do you have a written teaching load policy for chairs?

At least 49% of the colleges had a teaching load policy. All colleges that had a teaching load policy were asked to furnish a copy and 26% of the respondents did so. As shown in Appendix A, the written policies regarding load varied widely. One college reported a load as low as 6 hours per semester while several colleges offered a choice between a reduced teaching load based on their chair load factors or their receiving an overload stipend.

Table 11

Number and Percent of Colleges that have a Teaching Load Policy for Chairs

Have a Teaching Load Policy	Number	Percent
Yes	19	48.7
No	20	51.3
Total	39	100.0

Question 12. If not, do you think there needs to be a written policy that describes how the teaching load is determined for chairs? If yes was selected: Briefly explain what should be included in the policy.

As Table 12 shows, 51% of the participants believed there was a need for a written policy for determining the teaching load for chairs while the same percentage reported they did not have a written policy (Table 11). Twenty-three percent did not think there needed to be a written policy. Twenty-six percent did not respond to the question.

Table 12

Number and Percent of Respondents who Thought There Needed to be a Written Policy that Described How the Teaching Load for Chairs was Determined

Need a Written Policy	Number	Percent
Yes	20	51.3
No	9	23.1
Total	29	74.4
No Response	10	25.6
Total	39	100.0

Briefly explain what should be included in the policy.

Below are the suggestions from participants about what should be included in a written policy. Their responses are provided as submitted with minor editing to ensure clarity.

- “Roles and responsibilities, teaching loads, and responsibilities”
- “Method for calculating released time and job description”
- “The number of classes, the expectations, the duties”
- “Teaching responsibility; administrative responsibilities; college service; supervisory responsibilities”
- “Teaching load expectations. # of credits given for performing chair duties. Chair roles & responsibilities.”
- “Number of faculty for whom they are responsible to observe, assist, etc. number of students in the program, range of contact hours depending on other responsibilities”
- “The chairs/dean have different responsibilities. Some have larger divisions than others. Some advise students and some do not. Two have external accreditation affiliation which

requires much more paper work. It would be difficult to standardize the responsibilities at this institution.”

- “Division Chairs receive release time for administrative duties associated with their division.”
- “A formula considering number of faculty (adjuncts and full-time), programs, accreditations, sections, and other special projects as assigned that may require time.”
- “We already have this. It is determined by the union contract. There is a spreadsheet we use to determine the workload which includes teaching, advising, other work for each faculty.”
- “Depending on the size of the department or accreditation, some chairs are 100% administrators rather than faculty.”
- “To determine load, these factors should be included: Number of sections taught in the department, number of programs taught in the department, number of full time faculty the department, number of adjunct in the department, number of disciplines in the department, any external licensing requirements for programs in the department.”
- “expected load and any exceptions”

Question 13. Which factors do you presently use when determining the teaching load for chairs? (check all that apply)

The factors most used by the colleges, as reported in Table 13, included:

- administrative duties (74%)
- the number of full-time faculty (69%)
- part-time faculty supervised (62%)
- specialized accreditation (44%)

Table 13 also displays the percentages of each factor used by the respondents.

Table 13

*Percent of Respondents Using Listed Factors when Determining the Teaching Load for Chairs
(check all that apply)*

Administrative duties	74%
Number of full-time faculty supervised	69%
Number of part-time faculty supervised	62%
Specialized accreditation	44%
Committee duties	31%
Extensive curriculum development	28%
Student related responsibilities	26%
Number of non-instructional personnel supervised	26%
Complexity of their budget	21%
Number of grants submitted or managed	18%
Involvement in planning or remodeling facilities	15%
Need to radically revise budget	3%
Turnover in full-time faculty	0%
Other (see below)	23%

Twenty-three percent of the respondents reported using other factors when determining the chairs' teaching load. These additional factors were:

- Enrollment and advising
- Number of sections in program
- Number of courses offered

- Number of classes being taught
- Necessity for overload coverage within division

Question 14. Please check the top three factors you normally consider when determining teaching load.

The top three factors that were normally considered when determining the teaching load were administrative duties (64%), number of full-time faculty supervised (46%), and the number of part-time faculty supervised (39%). Table 14 displays the percentages of use for each listed factor by the participants.

Table 14

Percent of Use of Each Factor for Determining the Teaching Load for Chairs

Administrative duties	64%
Number of full-time faculty supervised	46%
Number of part-time faculty supervised	39%
Specialized accreditation	33%
Extensive curriculum development	21%
Student related responsibilities	15%
Committee duties	13%
Complexity of their budget	8%
Number of grants submitted or managed	5%
Involvement in planning or remodeling facilities	0%
Need to radically revise budget	0%
Number of non-instructional personnel supervised	0%
Turnover in full-time faculty	0%
Other (see below)	23%

As reported in Table 14 the respondents reported several factors other than those listed. The other factors they reported using included the following:

- Enrollment and advising
- Number of sections offered
- Department chair duties
- Number of courses offered

- Formula
- Teaching load is pre-determined, not based on any of the criteria above
- Total teaching load including overload

Question 15. Do you assign weight to the factors? If yes was selected: Please briefly explain or attach policy.

Table 15

Number and Percentage of Respondents Who Assigned Weight to the Factors

Do You Assign Weight to the Factors?	Number	Percent
Yes	7	17.9
No	32	82.1
Total	39	100.0

Several of the respondents who weighted the factors provided information about their weighting system. This information is reported below:

- Number of faculty is given the highest weighting
- Administrative duties carry the most weight. Some chairs receive more release time due to also being directors of specific programs, i.e. nursing, PTA, Virtual Campus
- Administrative duties = 3, Student responsibilities = 2, Number of faculty supervised = 2
- External accreditation and the size of a division

Question 16. Have there been recent changes made to the factors being used?

As shown in Table 16, 74% of the participants had not made recent changes to the factors they used to determine the teaching load for chairs.

Table 16

Number and Percentage of Respondents Who Have Recently Made Changes to the Factors Being Used to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs

Changes Recently Made to the Factors Used	Number	Percent
Yes	10	25.6
No	29	74.4
Total	39	100.0

Question 17. If yes, how many years has it been since the changes were made?

As represented in Table 16, 26% of the colleges had made changes in the last three years. Thirty-one percent had made changes in the last four to ten years while 5% had not made changes in 11 or more years (Table 17).

Table 17

Number and Frequency of Years Since Respondents Have Made Changes to the Factors Used to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs

Years Since Changes Have Been Made to the Factors Used	Number	Percent
0-3 years	10	25.6
4-7 years	9	23.1
8-10 years	3	7.7
11+ years	2	5.1
Total Responding	24	61.5
No Response	15	38.5
Total	39	100.0

Question 18. Why were the changes made? (check all that apply)

The three top reasons reported for making changes to the factors used to determine the teaching load for chairs were:

- at the suggestion of the chairs
- an increase in responsibilities

- at the suggestion of the administration

The percentages for the above reasons and the remaining choices provided in the survey are shown in the Table 18.

Table 18

Reason why Changes were Made (Respondents Could Check More Than One Response)

At the suggestion of the chairs	31%
Increase in responsibilities	31%
At the suggestion of the administration	23%
To make the teaching load process fairer to all	18%
Old approach was not working	8%
To make the teaching load process more transparent	5%
To simplify process	3%
To be competitive with other colleges	3%
Decrease in responsibilities	0%
To make the teaching load process easier to administer	0%
Other (please list) (see below)	8%

Additional reasons reported by the colleges for the changes they made all related to negotiated agreements. Not including the choice of a collective bargaining agreement in this question is identified as a limitation of the study.

- Union negotiations
- Chair stipends and reassigned time are negotiated in faculty contract
- Union contract renegotiated

- Through a meet and confer process involving faculty leadership and district administration

Question 19. Are you satisfied with the factors you are presently using to determine the teaching load for chairs?

As Table 19 reports, 69% of the respondents were satisfied with the factors they were using to determine the teaching load for their chairs.

Table 19

Number and Percent of Respondents Reporting their Satisfaction with the Factors They were Presently Using to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs

Satisfied with Factors Used to Determine Chair Teaching Load	Number	Percent
Yes	27	69.2
No	12	30.8
Total	39	100.0

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present data collected from a survey of public two-year community colleges in the United States about the factors and weights assigned to the factors that were being used to determine the teaching load for chairs. This chapter presented the results from the survey with some interpretive comments from the researcher.

CHAPTER 5

Overview, Findings, Conclusions, Limitations, Recommendations, and Concluding Remarks

This final chapter considers the implications of the data collected from chief academic officers in public community colleges who answered questions about the factors and the weight assigned to the factors they used to determine the teaching load for departmental chairs. The chapter also contains: an overview of the study, a discussion of the findings, conclusions drawn from the research questions, limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, recommendation for improved practice, and concluding remarks.

Overview of the Study

The Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the factors and the weight assigned to each factor that was being used by chief academic officers to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. It was hoped that through the analysis of the data workable solutions could be identified for use and adaptation by all community colleges to help in the process of assigning an equitable teaching load for chairs.

The Instrument

The research instrument used in this study was a survey. I collaborated with my dissertation advisor to create a draft of the survey instrument. This draft was then field-tested with a group of three chief academic officers in three community colleges. Once the results from the field-test were reviewed and recommended changes made to the instrument, the survey was entered into Qualtrics, an electronic survey software platform, and sent to the sample population via e-mail.

The final version of the research instrument was a quantitative survey consisting of 19 questions. Some of the questions allowed for written text to be entered. The first question asked for information about the college. The second question asked which accrediting body provided the accreditation for the college. Question number three provided a definition of the chair position and asked if the definition aligned with the colleges' definition of their chair position. The fourth question asked for the title of the person completing the survey. The remaining questions asked about characteristics of the chair position such as the factors used and the weight assigned to each factor when determining the teaching load for the chair position.

Population and Sample

The target population for the survey consisted of the 982 public community colleges in the United States of America as listed on the web site of the American Association of Community Colleges (retrieved March 24, 2016 from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfactsfactsheet.aspx>). Private colleges and colleges with religious affiliation were not included in the target population.

The sample consisted of a stratified random sample of community colleges that was representative of the target population. The stratifications were based on the number of full-time students. The groupings were as follows: fewer than 2500 students; 2500 – 4999 students; and 5000+ students. These size groupings were based on their use in studies by Underwood (1999) and Kinney (2008).

To achieve a 95% confidence level in the survey results with a sampling error rate of $\pm 4\%$, I used the Research Advisor's sample size table to determine the number of institutions to include in the sample (The Research Advisors, 2006). Once the institutions were stratified, a

proportional random sample of 375 (125 from each stratification) institutions was chosen from the list of public community colleges.

Community college chief academic officers whose college was selected from the target population received an introductory letter, via electronic mail, informing them about the survey. The introductory letter explained the purpose of the survey, how the results could benefit their institution, asked for their participation by completing the attached survey within seven business days, and asked them to submit a written copy, if available, of any written materials related to the approaches they were using to determine the teaching load for their departmental chairs.

Discussion of the Findings

The information gathered through the survey provided answers to the five research questions that were posed in chapter one. A discussion of the findings follows.

Research Question #1: What percent of colleges use factors, other than the number of full-time faculty, for determining chair teaching load?

All of the respondents (100%) to the survey used multiple factors, in addition to the number of full-time faculty, when determining the teaching load for chairs.

Research Question #2: What factors are colleges using to determine the teaching load for the chair position?

All respondents used all of the factors listed in the survey to determine the chairs' teaching load with one exception, turnover in full-time faculty. The most frequently selected category for determining the chair load was administrative duties with 74% of the respondents indicating their use of the category.

The second most often selected category was the number of full-time faculty supervised (69%) followed closely by the number of part-time faculty supervised (62%). Eight (of ten)

routine factors identified in the Branch (1982) study were all still being used by one or more colleges to determine the teaching load for the chairs.

1. Number of full-time faculty.
2. Number of part-time faculty.
3. General curriculum and instructional duties.
4. Number of advisory committees.
5. General duties related to students.
6. Complexity of the budget.
7. Number of non-instructional personnel.
8. Quantity of administrative duties.

The two factors in Branch's study that were not mentioned in this study were teaching and learning aids and geographic contiguity of division personnel. Three factors selected in this study that were identified in the Branch study, on an "as needed" basis were:

1. Specialized accreditation.
2. Number of grants submitted or managed.
3. Involvement in planning or remodeling facilities.

Seventeen (44%) of the institutions used specialized accreditation, seven (18%) used the number of grants submitted or managed, and six (15%) used the involvement in planning or remodeling facilities as factors.

Nine (23%) of the institutions provided factors in addition to the factors that were listed.

The added factors included:

- Enrollment and advising
- Number of sections in chair's area

- Number of courses offered
- Number of classes being taught
- Faculty contract
- Necessity for overload coverage within Division

Judging from the number of factors being used, it was apparent that colleges were attempting to find a fair and equitable solution for determining teaching load for chairs.

Research Question #3: How long have they been using current factors for determining the teaching load? What percent have made changes in the factors used in the last 10 years?

Two of the respondents (5.1%) reported using the same factors for at least 11 years. One fourth (26%) of the respondents had, within the last three years, made changes to the factors they were using. Over the last 10 years twenty-two (56%) had changed factors.

Research Question #4: If changes have been made, why were the changes made and what was the nature of the changes?

The major reasons for making changes were suggestions from the chairs (31%), the increased responsibilities of the chair position (31%), or the administration (23%).

Research Question #5: Are the chief academic officers (CAO) satisfied with their current system?

Although there was no consistency or formula identified in the approaches used to determine the teaching load for chairs, 69% of the chief academic officers were satisfied with the factors they were using. This may have been due to the individual tailoring of load by each instructional unit or college.

Conclusions

A number of conclusions were reached based on the responses to the survey. These are discussed beginning with the low response rate to the survey. Due to the low response rate (10%), the results reported in the survey are not generalizable to the target population and inhibited their use in developing a formula for determining the teaching load for chairs. Another finding was the change in the percentage of male chairs.

In 1992, Seagren et al (1994) reported that 59% of the chairs in community colleges were male. This indicated a need to provide opportunities for women to be hired in leadership positions in community colleges. Based on the results of my study, progress has been made in the hiring of women in leadership positions as evidenced by the drop in the percentage of chairs being male to 44%.

The findings show that 21% of the chairs had been in their position for 8-10 years with 15% reporting as being in the position for over 11 years. Another 54% reported they had been in the position for 4-7 years. If these numbers could be inferred to the target population, it would suggest that there is not an impending major turnover of personnel in the chair position.

Although the majority of the colleges are consistently using the same factors every year to determine the teaching load for chairs, it was reported that the teaching load changed for over 60% of the chairs. This suggests that institutions were adjusting load to match chair responsibilities.

Eight of the ten routine factors and all three of the occasional factors identified in Branch's 1982 study are still in use today. These were:

Routine:

1. Number of full-time faculty.
2. Number of part-time faculty.
3. General curriculum and instructional duties.
4. Number of advisory committees.
5. General duties related to students.
6. Complexity of the budget.
7. Number of non-instructional personnel.
8. Quantity of administrative duties.

Occasional:

1. Specialized accreditation.
2. Number of grants submitted or managed.
3. Involvement in planning or remodeling facilities.

Only five additional factors were reported as being used. These additional factors were:

1. Enrollment and advising.
2. Number of sections in chair's area.
3. Number of courses offered.
4. Number of classes being taught.
5. Necessity for overload coverage within instructional unit.

Despite the length of time between Branch's research in 1982 and my research in 2017, the above lists suggests that the factors reported by Branch are still a valid framework of factors for

chief academic officers to use when beginning the process of determining the teaching load for chair's. Surprisingly, two time consuming factors were not mentioned in either study. These were the time it takes to recruit and hire new faculty or leading a search committee.

Forty-nine percent of the colleges reported they had a written policy for determining the teaching load for chairs. A few of these colleges provided a written copy of their policy. An analysis of these indicated a wide variance in the written policies. This wide variance in the written policies indicated that colleges are trying to develop a fair and predictable plan for determining the teaching load for their chairs.

Fifty-one percent of the colleges reported there was a need for a written policy. Another 51% also reported they did not have a written policy for determining the teaching load for chairs. It would be interesting to know if these percentages represented the same colleges.

Eighty-two percent of the colleges did not assign weight to the factors. This raises a question. Without weighting the factors, how could they determine the teaching load for chairs in a way that was consistent, fair, and predictable?

The majority of the colleges (74%) had not recently (in the last three years) made changes to the factors they were using while 69% reported being satisfied with the factors they were using. This indicates that a majority of colleges have found an acceptable process to use to determine the teaching load for their chairs.

Limitations of the Study

As suggested by Creswell (2008), "limitations are potential weaknesses or problems with the study identified by the researcher" (p. 207). Four limitations were identified that may have exerted an influence on the results. The first limitation was the response rate. Only thirty-nine colleges (10%) of the sample population of 375 completed and submitted the survey. This made

generalizing the results to the target population impossible and also made it difficult to draw more definitive conclusions.

The second limitation was the inclusion of administrative duties in the list of factors that could be selected by the respondents to two of the survey questions. Upon reflection, this factor should not have been included in the list of choices in the survey since the respondents may have used it as a convenient “catch all” category, thus not encouraging some to identify the specific factors they were using.

A third limitation was including the WASC Senior College and University Commission instead of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities as the title of the accrediting association for colleges in that regional accrediting association. This deterred colleges from that region from participating in the survey.

The fourth and final limitation was not including collective bargaining agreements as a possible choice for why changes were made to the factors being used. The findings clearly showed that wording in union negotiations/contracts was a factor influencing the teaching load assigned to chairs.

Recommendations for Future Research

During the study, a number of recommendations for future study became evident. Some future scholar should:

1. Survey the chairs to determine if they are satisfied with the process used to determine their teaching load.
2. Ask the chairs how they think their teaching load should be determined.
3. Ask chairs if weighting the factors used to determine their teaching load would be desirable.

4. Assess the changes in the chair's responsibilities.
5. Ask chairs if they have up-to-date job descriptions.
6. Compare response rates to online surveys with results from paper surveys.

Recommendations for Improved Practice

Although the low response rate for this study prevented my developing results generalizable to the target population, I formed one insight that might assist those responsible for determining the teaching load for chairs. This insight was to draft a proposed framework for each college to use in writing a policy that aligns with their colleges' unique circumstances. This proposed framework follows:

Proposed Framework for Determining the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community Colleges

Rationale

The duties and responsibilities of chairs are many and vary from one chair position to another. What is needed is a rational, predictable, equitable way of determining workload for chairs. A recently completed national study of public community colleges at the University of Arkansas identified a list of factors colleges were using when determining how much time each chair was spending on these factors. By using the results of this study, a college could develop a process for determining the chair teaching load.

To do so, each college must identify factors relative to their institution and estimate the time each requires. The financial resources available to each college will definitely influence the amount of time a chair is reassigned from teaching responsibilities. A score of 12 in a wealthy college might result in a teaching load of one course while in a financially challenged college that same score could result in a teaching load of three courses.

The determination of teaching load for chairs needs to be made each term and to be jointly determined by the chief academic officer and the individual chairperson. It is accepted that this method cannot take into account individual differences, such as managerial style, work efficiency, or motivation.

**Suggested Procedure for Institutions to Follow in
Developing a Plan to Assign a Teaching Load for Chairs**

1. Recognize the need for determining the teaching workload for chairs using a rational, predictable, and equitable process.
2. Decide the factors that are to be included in the workload formula. These factors need to be described in terms of the chair duties in that college.
3. Determine a method for assigning a weighted value to each factor. This value should reflect the amount of time usually spent by chairpersons on the different factors.
4. Develop a formula based on the factors and their time values.
5. Develop some guidelines for administering the formula. These may include:
 - a. How often the workload is determined, preferably each term.
 - b. Who makes the determination, preferably the chief academic officer and chair.
 - c. Suggestions for determining suitable teaching loads, i.e., 18 time units would result in a 6 credit hour teaching load and so on.
 - d. Who administers the plan and/or settles any related questions or disputes.

**Sample Worksheet for Calculating the Teaching Load for
Chairs in Public Community Colleges**

<u>Routine Factors</u>	x	Weight by Time Units*	= Units
1. No. of full-time faculty	x	__ for each person	= ____
2. No. of part-time faculty	x	__ for each person	= ____
3. General curriculum & instructional duties	x	__ normal ongoing operations (routine planning, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum offerings)	= ____
4. No. of advisory committees	x	__ for each committee for which chair is responsible	= ____
5. General duties related to students	x	__ general student-related problem solving	= ____
6. Complexity of the budget	x	__ non-lab transfer/general education	= ____
7. No. of non-instructional personnel	x	__ for each full-time non-teaching person supervised by chairperson	= ____
	x	__ for each part-time non-teaching person, (including student workers), supervised by Chairperson	= ____
8. Enrollment and advising	x	To be negotiated	= ____
9. No. of sections in chair's area	x	To be negotiated	= ____
10. No. of courses offered	x	To be negotiated	= ____
11. No. of classes being taught	x	To be negotiated	= ____
12. Necessity for overload coverage within instructional unit	x	To be negotiated	= ____
13. Quantity of administrative duties	x	__ for every chairperson in recognition of duties performed that are not described above	= ____
		Subtotal for Routine Factors	= ____

*Each time unit is equal to one clock hour during an average work week.
Each college will need to establish its own time unit or weighting system.

Occasional Factors

1. Specialized accreditation	x	To be negotiated	= ____
2. Number of grants submitted or managed	x	To be negotiated	= ____
3. Involvement in planning or remodeling facilities	x	To be negotiated	= ____
4. Recruiting new faculty**	x	To be negotiated	= ____
5. Chairing search committees**	x	To be negotiated	= ____

Subtotal for Occasional Factors = ____

Final Total = ____

Proposed Guidelines for Assigning Teaching Load (these must be developed by each college because the ranges of the workload must be defined for each campus)

If total units are:

__ to __
 __ to __
 __ to __
 __ to __
 __ and over

Teaching load is:

12 Credits/Term
 9 Credits/Term
 6 Credits/Term
 3 Credits/Term
 0 Credits/Term***

Note: If clerical assistance (full-time, part-time, student worker, etc. is made available to some chairs, but not all, the formula could be modified to reflect this.

** Neither of these factors, which are an integral part of chair's responsibilities, were reported in either Branch's or my study.

***If the chair is seen as a faculty position, then an assistant chair or lead instructor would have to be appointed to assume some of the administrative load.

Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this study was to identify a formula for determining the teaching load for chairs that could be used by chief academic officers in public community colleges. While the responding colleges were not using the same factors when determining the teaching load for chairs, this study did identify a comprehensive list of factors to use when determining the chairs' teaching load. This information could guide future research and possibly serve as the framework for each college interested in building a rational, predictable, fair way for determining the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges.

References

- American Association of Community Colleges. (2016). Retrieved February 17, 2016 from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/AACCFactSheetsR2.pdf>.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2016). Retrieved March 24, 2016 from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfactsfactsheet.aspx>.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2012). *Statement on Faculty Workload with Interpretive Comments*.
- Branch, C. M. (1982). *An approach for determining workload of Department/division chairpersons in two-year public colleges*. (University of Arkansas). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 218 p. Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/303186748?accountid=8361.303186748>.
- Branch, C. M., & Hammons, J. (1984). Determining Workload of Department/Division Chairpersons. *Community College Review*, 11(4), 26-29.
- Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing Company.
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2016). Retrieved April 4, 2016 from http://www.chea.org/4DCGI/cms/review.html?Action=CMS_Document&DocID=197&MenuKey=main.
- Creswell, John W. (2008). *Educational Research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Publishing Company.
- Dyer, B. G., & Miller, M. (1999). *A Critical Review of Literature Related to the Department Chair Position*.
- Gabert, G., & Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, B.I. (1991). *Community Colleges in the 1990s. Fastback, No. 318*.
- Gallagher, J. (2003). *A Study of Department Chairs in Two-year Colleges: A Comparison of the 1992 International Community College Chair Survey to Department Chairs in the North Texas Community College Consortium* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas).
- Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1994). Sources of stress for academic department chairpersons. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(1), 79-79. Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/220472297?accountid=8361>.

- Grau, M. R. (1997). *An investigation of the job-related stressors of department chairpersons in a selected community college system*. (Ed.D., Texas Southern University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, (304410082).
- Hammons, J. (1984). The Department/Division Chairperson: Educational Leader?. *Community And Junior College Journal*, 54(6), 14-19.
- Hoffman, S., & Others, A. (1996). *Teaching and managing: Conflicting roles of the department chair*.
- Hussar, W. J., & Bailey, T. M. (2013). Projections of Education Statistics to 2021. NCES 2013-008. *National Center for Education Statistics*.
- Kinney, D. P. (2008). *Organizational structure in community colleges: Past, present and future*. (Ed.D., University of Arkansas). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, (304686891).
- Kuhl, D. D. (2004). *Institutional support factors for community college chairs' performance*. University of Arkansas. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/305220961?accountid=8361>. (305220961).
- Mancing, H. (1994). A Theory of Faculty Workload. *ADFL Bulletin*, 25(3), 31-37. doi:10.1632/adfl.25.3.31.
- Mitchell, J. N. (2004). Measuring the performance of the chair. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2004(126), 55-68.
- Murray, J. P., & Murray, J. I. (1998). Job satisfaction and the propensity to leave an institution among two-year college division chairpersons. *Community College Review*, 25(4), 45.
- Phillippe K., Patton M., American Association of Community Colleges W. National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends & Statistics, 3D Edition. [serial online] January 1, 2000; Available from: ERIC, Ipswich, MA. Accessed January 21, 2016.
- Phillippe, K.A., Sullivan, L.G., & American Association of Community Colleges, W.D. (2005). *National Profile of Community Colleges Trends and Statistics, 4th Edition*, American Association of Community Colleges.
- Response Rates. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://facultyinnovate.utexas.edu/sites/default/files/response_rates.pdf.
- Seagren, A.T., Wheeler, D.W., Creswell, J.W., Miller, M.T., and VanHorn-Grassmeyer (1994). *Academic Leadership in Community Colleges*. University of Nebraska Press.

- Scibelli, A.M. (2001). Community Colleges Celebrate a Century of Change. *Businesswest*, 18(2), 12.
- Smith, A. B., & Stewart, G. A. (1999). A statewide survey of new department chairs: Their experiences and needs in learning their roles. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (105), 29.
- The Research Advisors (2006). Sample size table. Retrieved from <http://www.research-advisors.com/tools/SampleSize.htm>.
- Underwood, J. C. (1991). *Past, present, and future variations in community college organizational structure: A national longitudinal assessment* (Order No. 9204759). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (303939823). Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/303939823?accountid=8361>.
- Underwood, J.C., & Hammons, J.O. (1999). Past, present, and future variations in community college organizational structure. *Community College Review*, 26(4), 39.
- Vaughan, G. B., & American Association of Community Colleges, W.D., (2006). *The Community College Story, Third Edition*, American Association of Community Colleges.

Appendix A

Written Policies Provided by Respondents

- “The normal teaching load can vary from six to fifteen hours depending on the contract. Faculty who have fewer than fifteen hours assigned to them will usually be assigned other responsibilities such as division chairs, athletic directors and coaches, construction supervision, landscaping design, etc.”
- “The Department Chair is a full- time faculty member who provides administrative support to the full and part-time faculty of a set of disciplines or a large department in which s/he holds a teaching appointment. The Chair may opt for 9 hours of course release time distributed over two semesters, or the equivalent in the form of a stipend.”
- “Except as modified by other provisions of this Article, a Division Chair will receive a reduced load of twelve (12) contract hours per academic year. For each hour of reduced load, the Division Chair shall schedule with the Vice President for Academic Affairs at the beginning of each semester one hour on campus. Each Division Chair shall schedule one and one-half of these hours on Wednesdays from 12:30 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. for the purposes of the Vice President for Academic Affairs Staff/Divisional Affairs. The other hours may be scheduled to coincide with meetings for which the Division Chair is acting as a Division Chair, a representative for Divisional Affairs, or as a member of the Faculty.”
- “The department head receives time from teaching duties based on the level and volume of administrative responsibility. The minimum teaching load for a department head, with the exception of restricted admission departments, is 12 load hours per academic year with the maximum teaching load being 27 load hours for 10-month faculty and 14.5 to

32.5 for 12-month faculty. Department heads, with the exception of restricted admission departments, will have their teaching loads decreased based upon the following factors:

Full-time faculty or administrators supervised reduction: 1 load hour per full-time faculty member or administrator to a maximum of 9 load hours per year: Part-time faculty supervised Reduction: .30 load hour per different part-time faculty member to a maximum of 4.5 load hours per semester and 9 load hours per year: Disciplines within the department Reduction: .50 load hour per discipline to a maximum of 3 load hours per year Laboratory(ies) maintained (without laboratory staff) reduction: 1 load hour per laboratory to a maximum of 3 load hours per year: 3 load hours per year for a facility regardless of the number of laboratories within the building: Department head loads will be reduced to the nearest possible course load. If a department head is eligible for a 7-credit load reduction and all classes in the department are 3 load hours, the person will be reduced by two classes and paid 1 hour of overload for the extra hour. Overload will be paid for department heads only after the spring semester load is determined.”

- “Department Chairs will teach their assigned teaching load and, in addition, will receive a stipend to assume the responsibility of department coordination and curriculum development over the nine-month academic year.
- “Teach 15 workload units per year with associated faculty duties. This duty is performed daily, about 45% of the time.
- “Maintain a minimum of twelve required office hours per week in addition to a regularly scheduled teaching load.” “An instructor’s contractual teaching assignment will normally be thirty credit hours of lecture classes per annual contract.”

- “Departmental Administration and Support reassigned time is authorized to perform departmental and programmatic administrative duties, which can be carried out by department chairs, deputy chairs, or coordinators.” This is based on a chart of release time formula and can be different for each major area.
- Allied Health

6 credits	Baseline
3 credits	75 + sections
3 credits	1 or more majors
0 credits	250 + FTE
12	TOTAL

Behavior and Social Science

6 credits	Baseline
3 credits	75 + sections
3 credits	1 or more majors
3 credits	250 + FTE
15	TOTAL

Business

6 credits	Baseline
0 credits	75 + sections
3 credits	1 or more majors
0 credits	250 + FTE
9	TOTAL

Education

6 credits	Baseline
3 credits	75 + sections
3 credits	1 or more majors
3 credits	250 + FTE
15	TOTAL

English

6 credits	Baseline
3 credits	75 + sections
0 credits	1 or more majors
0 credits	250 + FTE
9	TOTAL

Humanities

6 credits	Baseline
3 credits	75 + sections
3 credits	1 or more majors
0 credits	250 + FTE
12	TOTAL

Language and Cognition

6 credits	Baseline
0 credits	75 + sections
0 credits	1 or more majors
0 credits	250 + FTE
6	TOTAL

Mathematics

6 credits	Baseline
3 credits	75 + sections
3 credits	1 or more majors
0 credits	250 + FTE
12	TOTAL

Natural Sciences

6 credits	Baseline
3 credits	75 + sections
3 credits	1 or more majors
0 credits	250 + FTE
12	TOTAL

Reassigned Policy for Departmental Administration

Service Category	Credits or Formula	Explanation
Baseline	6 credits	Three of the six credits are subject to annual review based on the department's level of activity and productivity as determined in the chair's annual evaluation. A new chair may receive 3 additional credits for the first semester.
Large Departments	3 credits for every 75 sections	Departments receive this based on the number of class sections scheduled each semester
Majors	3 credits if a department has one or more majors, 3 additional credits if the total enrollment for all majors exceeds 250 FTE students	Departments with departmental majors receive these credits.
Special Academic Services	Provost Determination	Departments with special structures, programs, functions warranting additional administrative reassignments are eligible for additional credits based on an analysis of the workloads involved.

Departmental Administration and Support reassigned time is authorized to perform departmental and programmatic administrative duties, which can be carried out by department chairs, deputy chairs, or coordinators.

- “Teaching department chairpersons shall be assigned a teaching load not to exceed 20 contact hours or 12 credit hours whichever is less.”
- Breakdown of Criteria for Load Reductions During Academic Year

RESPONSIBILITY	LOAD REDUCTION / SEMESTER (Apply to Table 3)
Base Responsibility: Administrative, Department Representation, Curriculum Development, etc.	4 credits
FT Faculty and Staff	>5 FT Faculty/Staff = 1 credit
Untenured Faculty	>3 Untenured Faculty = 1 credit
Adjunct Faculty	10-14 Adjuncts = 1 credit 15+ Adjuncts = 1 credit (maximum 2 credits)
Number of Sections	>30 sections = 2 credits
A.A.S./Career Programs	1 AAS/program = 1 credit
Oversight chemical handling/disposal in lab facilities: OSHA compliance, PESH and EPA adherence.	1 credit

Appendix B

Chairs—As used herein, chair is the term used to refer to persons whose college might have given them any of the following titles: department chair, division chair, coordinator, director, or assistant dean. What they share in common is that they are considered to primarily be faculty, not administrators, they continue to teach, they develop class schedules, supervise and evaluate faculty, and they develop and administer budgets for one or more departments or programs.

PART 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

The questions in this section are intended to gain information about the college. Please fill in the blank or check the box next to the appropriate answer.

1. College Information:
 Name of College: _____
 Street/P.O. Box: _____
 City/State/Zip Code: _____
2. Which Association accredits your college?
 - Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Western Association of Schools and Colleges
 - Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
 - Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
 - New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC-CIHE) Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
 - Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
 - WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)
3. Does the above definition for chair align with your college's definition of the chair position?
 - Yes No

If not, please stop and return questionnaire.

4. Title of Person Responding.
- President
 - Vice-President/Provost
 - Chief Academic Officer
 - Dean
 - Associate Dean
 - Other _____
5. Estimate the median age of your current chairs?
- 25-30
 - 31-35
 - 36-40
 - 41-45
 - 46-50
 - 51-55
 - 56-60
 - 61-65
6. What approximate percentage of your chairs is male?
- _____
7. What is the average number of years of service in the chair position for the current chairs on your campus?
- 0-3
 - 4-7
 - 8-10
 - 11+
8. Is the teaching load for chairs constant or does it change yearly?
- Yes No
9. Is the teaching load the same for all chairs?
- Yes No
10. What is the average number of classes taught by chairs?
- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - Other _____

11. Do you have a written teaching load policy for chairs?
 Yes No
 a. If so, please attach document and send to e-mail address:
mandel.samuels@sbcglobal.net when returning the survey.
12. If not, do you think there needs to be a written policy that describes how the teaching load is determined for chairs?
 Yes No
 a. Briefly explain what should be included in the policy.

13. Which factors do you presently use when determining the teaching load for chairs?
 (check all that apply)
 Administrative duties
 Committee duties
 Complexity of their budget
 Extensive curriculum development
 Involvement in planning or remodeling facilities
 Need to radically revise budget
 Number of full-time faculty supervised
 Number of part-time faculty supervised
 Number of non-instructional personnel supervised
 Student related responsibilities
 Specialized accreditation
 Turnover in full-time faculty
 Number of grants submitted or managed
 Other _____
14. Please check the top three factors you normally consider when determining teaching load.
 Administrative duties
 Committee duties
 Complexity of their budget
 Extensive curriculum development
 Involvement in planning or remodeling facilities
 Need to radically revise budget
 Number of full-time faculty supervised
 Number of part-time faculty supervised
 Number of non-instructional personnel supervised

- Student related responsibilities
- Specialized accreditation
- Turnover in full-time faculty
- Number of grants submitted or managed
- Other _____

15. Do you assign weight to the factors?

- Yes No

a. If so please briefly explain or attach policy.

16. Have there been recent changes made to the factors being used?

- Yes No

17. If yes, how many years has it been since the changes were made?

- 0-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-10 years
- 11+ years

18. Why were the changes made? (check all that apply)

- At the suggestion of the chairs
- At the suggestion of the administration
- Increase in responsibilities
- Decrease in responsibilities
- Old approach was not working
- Simplified process
- To be competitive with other colleges
- To make the teaching load process easier to administer
- To make the teaching load process more transparent
- To make the teaching load process fairer to all
- Other _____

(please list)

19. Are you satisfied with the factors you are presently using to determine the teaching load for chairs?

- Yes No

As a participant you will receive a selected summary of the results of the study. Thank you for your time and participation.

Appendix C

First Letter Sent to Sample Population

February 14, 2017

Dear

From 1973 - 1995, my doctoral advisor, Dr. Jim Hammons, with several colleagues, conducted over 60 two or three-day campus or regional workshops for two-year college chairs. He started each workshop by asking participants to rank order the problems preventing them from being more effective. When group after group ranked workload in their top five, he worked with Carolyn Branch, a division chair, to do a national Delphi study to determine the factors that chairs and deans/VPs felt should be considered. They published the results in the *Community College Review* in spring 1984, volume 11, number 4, pages 26-29. Since then, no one has published a more recent study. Due to the lack of a recent study on such a critical issue in community colleges, I decided to conduct a research study on community colleges to see if the workload of chairs is still an issue.

This research on community colleges is being done as part of my doctoral program in Higher Education Administration at the University of Arkansas, under the direction of Dr. Hammons. I would appreciate you taking ten to fifteen minutes of your time to complete the survey. I believe that the results of the study will justify the time that your participation will require. Unless you decline, you will receive a selected summary of the results of the study.

Be assured that the names of the individual participants and institutions will remain anonymous in the final research report. The study is designed to reflect the responses from the

administrators in community colleges who are responsible for assigning the teaching load for chairs.

I respectfully ask that you complete and submit the survey by February 23, 2017. Please click on the link included in this e-mail or copy and paste the web address into your browser.

Thank you for your time and valuable assistance.

Cordially,

Mandel G. Samuels
HIED/COEHP
103 Graduate Education Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-7694
mandel.samuels@sbcglobal.net

IRB #16-09-069

Approved: 10/14/2016

Expires: 10/13/2017

Appendix D
Second Letter Sent to Sample Population

February 21, 2017

Dear

Approximately one week ago you received an e-mail requesting your participation in a study on the factors used to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges.

Your participation is very important to the success of this study. I believe the results of the study will be of sufficient benefit to you and your institution to justify the time that your participation will require.

Be assured that the names of the individual participants and institutions will remain anonymous in the final research report. The study is designed to reflect the responses from the administrators in community colleges who are responsible for assigning the teaching load for chairs. I respectfully ask that you complete the survey and submit by February 23, 2017. To take the survey, please click on the link included with this e-mail or copy and paste the web address into your browser. Thank you for your time and valuable assistance.

Unless you decline, you will receive a selected summary of the results of the study.

Thank you for your time and participation.

Cordially,

Mandel G. Samuels
HIED/COEHP
103 Graduate Education Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-7694
mandel.samuels@sbcglobal.net

IRB #16-09-069

Approved: 10/14/2016

Expires: 10/13/2017

Appendix E

Final Letter Sent to Sample Population

February 23, 2017

Dear Survey Participant's Name:

Earlier this month you received an e-mail requesting your participation in a study on the factors used to determine the teaching load for chairs in public community colleges. Thank you for taking the time to complete and return the survey. Your contribution will ensure the success of this research and provide valuable information for you and your institution. Have a great weekend.

Cordially,

Mandel G. Samuels
HIED/COEHP
103 Graduate Education Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701
479-575-7694
mandel.samuels@sbcglobal.net

IRB #16-09-069

Approved: 10/14/2016

Expires: 10/13/2017

Appendix F

IRB Approval Letter



Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board

October 18, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mandel Samuels
James Hammons

FROM: Ro Windwalker
IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #: 16-09-069

Protocol Title: *Factors Used to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community Colleges*

Review Type: EXEMPT EXPEDITED FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 10/14/2016 Expiration Date: 10/13/2017

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (<https://vpred.uark.edu/units/rscp/index.php>). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 375 participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

Appendix G

IRB Project Modification Approval Letter



Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board

November 2, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mandel Samuels
James Hammons

FROM: Ro Windwalker
IRB Coordinator

RE: PROJECT MODIFICATION

IRB Protocol #: 16-09-069

Protocol Title: *Factors Used to Determine the Teaching Load for Chairs in Public Community Colleges*

Review Type: EXEMPT EXPEDITED FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 11/02/2016 Expiration Date: 10/13/2017

Your request to modify the referenced protocol has been approved by the IRB. This protocol is currently approved for 375 total participants. If you wish to make any further modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

Please note that this approval does not extend the Approved Project Period. Should you wish to extend your project beyond the current expiration date, you must submit a request for continuation using the UAF IRB form "Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects." The request should be sent to the IRB Coordinator, 109 MLKG Building.

For protocols requiring FULL IRB review, please submit your request at least one month prior to the current expiration date. (High-risk protocols may require even more time for approval.) For protocols requiring an EXPEDITED or EXEMPT review, submit your request at least two weeks prior to the current expiration date. Failure to obtain approval for a continuation *on or prior to* the currently approved expiration date will result in termination of the protocol and you will be required to submit a new protocol to the IRB before continuing the project. Data collected past the protocol expiration date may need to be eliminated from the dataset should you wish to publish. Only data collected under a currently approved protocol can be certified by the IRB for any purpose.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.