

Draft rewrite of Lecturer statement
Neill Megaw/ 12 Dec 81

Note: all additions underlined; older text hyphenated out. Changes restricted to numerical/arithmetical clarification and a few stylistic, nonsubstantive changes in the parts leading immediately into and following immediately out of the numerical breakdown of workload.

Until 1979, the normal course load for English Department Lecturers (then called Instructors) was 4/3, a load considered excessive by most. In 1979, the course load was further increased by 14.3%, to 4/4, perhaps to accommodate the dramatically increasing numbers of lower-division students. We feel very strongly that this increase was a mistake, one that does a disservice both to lower-division students and to the Lecturers who teach them. We feel that this is an opportune time to reverse the trend of imposing larger workloads on lower-division teachers. Last year President Flawn demonstrated his and the University's commitment to the quality of lower-division English by reducing the load of Assistant Instructors by 25% from 2/2 to 2/1. We applaud that move and suggest that it is now time to carry that commitment a logical step further and reduce the teaching load of Lecturers in the English Department by 25% to 3/3. As the following analysis shows, such a reduction would be reasonable in terms of the amount of time required. It should be noted that all courses taught by Lecturers

~~Lecturers-actually-must-now-spend-teaching.-Consider-the-workload-of-the-English-Department-Lecturer,-all-of-whose-courses-contain a substantial writing component.~~

Teaching four courses per semester, a Lecturer typically

--teaches a minimum of 100 students (actual average ca. 125)

~~-100-400-students-(4-classes-X-25-40--
-students-per-class)-~~

=12 contact
hours/wk.

--corrects a minimum of 700 essays (50 essays per week X 14 weeks), at 20-30 minutes per essay

~~-700-800-essays-(50-essays-per-week-X-20-30
minutes-per-essay)-~~

=16:40-25 hrs./wk.

--corrects a minimum of 75 tests, at 10-15 mins./test

=0:50-1:20 hrs./wk.

----- (Not in original text) -----

--prepares for 168 lecture/discussion meetings (including preparation of syllabi, tests, handouts), at 1:30-

2 hours preparation per contact hour

=9-12 hours/week

~~-170-hours-of-lectures-(assuming-2-different-
-classes-X-3-contact-hours-per-course-X-2-hours-
-preparation-per-contact-hour)-~~

--spends 100-140 hours in student conferences

=7-10 hours/wk.

TOTAL =45:30-~~60~~ 20 hrs./wk.

=46-59-hours/wk.--

These figures suggest that, on the average, a Lecturer spends 53 hours a week exclusively on the conducting of these four ~~XXXXX~~ classes. Such a ~~on-strictly-teaching-and-teaching-related-activities,---~~

load cuts into time that should be available for family and personal concerns. More important, at least from the professional point of view, it permits virtually no time for extensive reading, for scholarly investigation and writing, for detailed course revision or development of new curricular proposals, or for unhurried intellectual exchanges with colleagues. Such activities we take to be essential professional

-obviously-permits-no-time-for-scholarly-pursuits,-curriculum-enrichment,-or-intellectual-exchange-with-colleagues,-

obligations for the university faculty member. A 25% reduction in the present teaching load for Lecturers would allow us some time for this-load-would-limit-the-time-required-for-teaching-to-a-reasonable-40-hours-per-week,-and-would-enable-Lecturers-to-devote-at-least-some-time-to-their-scholarly-interests-and-families.- those activities, since the average time for the conduct of classes alone would be reduced to approximately 40 hours per week.

A survey of the Lecturers supports these the-given figures. One Lecturer in his second year at UT reports:

By the end of this semester I will have graded 720 essays and 115 tests, prepared 84 lectures and made 168 presentations, and kept 100 office hours. Allowing myself a mere 15 minutes to grade a paper and but two hours to prepare a lecture, I calculate I make around \$7 an hour; a 3/3 load would give 20 minutes a paper and \$9 an hour. . . . I respectfully suggest that the students at this university deserve teachers with more than 15 minutes for their work and 5 minutes for their visits. I want to teach as effectively as possible. A 3/3 load is a step in that direction.

The other statements that appear in the following appendix testify that, given the 4/4 class load, the number of students per class, and the amount of writing required, the Lecturers cannot do an adequate job of teaching lower-division courses without working much more than 40 hours a week. As a result, Lecturers are forced to compromise their teaching, their scholarly careers, or their personal lives. It is our considered opinion that reducing the teaching load of Lecturers is necessary to safeguard and improve the quality of lower-division teaching and to release Lecturers from the unfair and unreasonable burden they are presently under.

As long as the Lecturers are required to teach four courses, their workload will only permit them to engage in the immediate classroom activities of their profession. Most of them will be unable to keep up with their profession by reading recent scholarship, by going to conferences, or by writing scholarly materials themselves. In other words, they will constitute a special faculty subgroup, some 60 persons strong, carrying a community college teaching load, an arrangement injurious to our image as a research university committed to the union of teaching and scholarship.

Reasons for changes:

1. The excerpt from one Lecturer's comments given on the following page, since highlighted, should be reflected in the breakdown figures. So I reduce 170 to 168 meetings and add an item, I hope on the conservative side, for test-grading.
2. It is important, I think, that all items be convincing. The most vulnerable one is that for preparation. Many of us do indeed spend 2 hours, or even 3 or more, per preparation; others, especially for a course taught before, skin by with $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours. Since I had added the time for test-grading, I thought this could be revised downward without increasing the total amount of time claimed. And I bolster even the $1\frac{1}{2}$ hour minimum claim by referring to the clerical labors we often forget.
3. The percentage increase in moving from $4/3$ to $4/4$ I think helps in making the 25% reduction less demanding.
4. The verbal changes after the tabular breakdown do not, I think change the substance of either our request or the argument, but bring in a touch of the Kinneavy argument in the last para, and answer Tom Whitbread's question about whether the family obligation should be dropped or else mentioned whenever appropriate.