

An Analysis of Full-time Academic Workload in Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario, 1997-98

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the survey of the 1997-98 academic staff workload in Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario. The survey was designed to compile information recorded on the Standard Workload Form (SWF), which forms a part of the negotiated terms and conditions of academic employees covered by the 1996-2001 collective agreement between the Ontario Council of Regents for the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and the Ontario Public Service Employees Union (for academic employees).

This survey was conducted by the Office of Collective Bargaining Information in consultation with the College Relations Commission Information Services (CRCIS) Advisory Committee. The terms of reference for the CRCIS Advisory Committee are set out in the Memorandum of Understanding appended to the 1996-2001 college academic collective agreement.

This report is divided into four sections. Section 2 deals with the data submission and processing; Section 3 is a summary analysis of the data; Section 4 includes the tables referenced in Sections 2 and 3; and the Appendices include frequency distribution of class size and college-specific data collection.

2.0 COLLEGE DATA SUBMISSION/PROCESSING

2.1 College Response

Of the 25 colleges, 22 colleges provided SWF data to the Office of Collective Bargaining Information. Of the 22 reporting colleges 15 have jointly assigned off@ their data by the college administration and OPSEU local president. See Appendix B for notes regarding the college submissions.

2.2 Data Verification and Error Checking

Preliminary data checking included the identification of duplicate and/or unusable records and the data was then converted to a standard record layout and read into CRC constructed SAS datasets. This was followed by a more detailed review of the data consisting of several checkpoint analyses. The checkpoints identified are as follows:

X missing data;

- X data values falling outside limits established in the collective agreement;
- X differences in reported values and those calculated through the application of a formula in the agreement; and,
- X Aflags@ that indicate unusual data values but are not necessarily indicators of errors.

A series of verification reports for each college was generated listing all records which had produced a checkpoint message. 9 colleges submitted corrections and the revisions have been incorporated into the datasets.

2.3 Data Limitations

The information in this report was derived on data submitted by individual colleges. While every effort was made by both the colleges and the CRC to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the data, the following general limitations should be noted and any conclusions drawn from the analysis should be viewed in this light.

- 1) Full-time employees on reduced or less-than-full-time workload were not identified.
- 2) For those colleges which did not report any AnonSWF@ academic staff, we do not know if these colleges reported only those academic staff with SWFs or if all of their academic staff had SWFs.
- 3) The number of staff reported on the Council of Regents academic staff survey for 1997-98 varies from the number of staff reported in this survey. The Council of Regents survey reported 6,499 full-time academic staff. Excluding the three colleges that did not submit SWF data, the number of staff would be 5,731. The data provided to the CRC for the same period totalled 5,524 full-time academic staff - a difference of 207. The colleges were not asked to reconcile the difference.
- 4) Unless otherwise indicated all percentages throughout this report are based on the 5,524 employees reported.

For data limitations regarding specific colleges, please see Appendix B.

2.4 Classification of Academic Employees

2.4.1 Type of Employee (Table 2)

Based on the data provided:

- X 5,348 (96.8%) of the staff were classified as professor
- X 113 (2.0%) were classified as counsellors
- X 21 (0.4%) were classified as librarians
- X 24 (0.4%) were classified as instructors,
- X 18 (0.3%) were not classified.

2.4.2 Position of Responsibility: Regular/Coordinator (Tables 3.1, 3.2)

Of the 5,524 staff reported:

- X 4,452 (80.6%) in fall 1997 and 4,505 (81.6%) in winter 1998 were classified as regular staff;
- X 798 (14.4%) in fall 1997 and 659 (11.9%) in winter 1998 were classified as Coordinator I;
- X 274 (5.0%) in fall 1997 and 360 (6.5%) in winter 1998 were classified as Coordinator II.

2.4.3 Service Status: Non-Probationary/Probationary (Table 4)

5,125 employees (92.8%) were classified as non-probationary, and 177 (3.2%) were classified as probationary employees. Colleges did not provide service status data for 222 employees (4.0%).

Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 report the break down by Employee Type.

2.4.4 SWF Availability: Reasons for No SWF (Tables 6.1, 6.2)

Colleges reported that a total of 483 employees did not have SWFs at any time in the 1997-98 academic year. The various reasons are as follows (percentages based on 483 employees):

- X 31 (6.4%) took professional development leave,
- X 55 (11.4%) took personal leave,
- X 6 (1.2%) took maternity/parental leave,
- X 4 (0.8%) took prepaid leave,
- X 73 (15.1%) were on LTD,
- X 5 (1.0%) were on union business,
- X 3 (0.6%) were on vacation,
- X 40 (8.3%) were on project assignment,
- X 19 (3.9%) were on sabbatical leave,
- X 122 (25.3%) were on non teaching assignments
- X 125 (25.9%) did not have a SWF for reasons other than those listed above or reason not provided.

3.0 ANALYSIS OF THE SWF DATA

Analysis of the 1997-98 SWF data is based on the data provided in each of the two snapshot periods (October 27 - October 31, 1997 and February 23 - 27, 1998), and year-end totals from the final SWF of the 1997-98 academic year. If a snapshot week was between intakes, the college used the week immediately following the snapshot week noted above.

The sections on the following pages provide selected highlights from each of the tables included in the report. Sections 3.1 to 3.6 are based on the two snapshot periods and Section 3.7 summarizes year-end data.

3.1 Workload by Function (Tables 7.1, 7.2)

Article 11 of the collective agreement sets out a comprehensive formula for the determination of workload. Four factors to be considered in establishing workload are: teaching contact hours, attributed hours for preparation, attributed hours for evaluation and feedback, and attributed hours for complementary functions.

3.1.1 Assigned Teaching Contact Hours

Article 11.01 I states that assigned teaching contact hours in post-secondary programs shall not exceed 18 in any week, and in non post-secondary programs shall not exceed 20 in any week. Based on the data provided, the average weekly teaching contact hours across the system were 14.1 hours in the fall snapshot, and 14.0 hours in the winter snapshot.

The individual college averages ranged from 7.8 hours (Grand Lacs) to 16.1 hours (Conestoga) in the fall snapshot. In the winter snapshot, the averages ranged from 7.2 hours (Grands Lacs) to 15.9 hours (Conestoga).

3.1.2 Attributed/Additional Preparation Hours

Article 11.01 D 1 sets out the method to be used for determining the amount of preparation time attributed and assigned. Preparation time is calculated through a combination of attributed hours (a ratio of hours per assigned teaching contact hour dependent on the type of course section), and additional preparation hours assigned. (See section 3.4.1 below for an analysis of preparation factors). Based on the data provided, the weekly preparation hours across all colleges averaged 8.5 hours in the fall snapshot and 8.4 hours in the winter snapshot.

Individual college averages ranged from 7.1 hours (Sir Sandford Fleming and La Cité) to 10.3 hours (St. Clair) in the fall snapshot, and from 7.0 hours (Sir Sandford Fleming) to 10.4 hours (St. Clair) in the winter snapshot.

3.1.3 Attributed Evaluation and Feedback Hours

Article 11.01 E 1 sets out the method to be used for determining evaluation/feedback time. Attributed hours are calculated on a per student basis depending on the type of evaluation/feedback required for the course. Courses requiring more than one type of evaluation/feedback are assigned a multiple ratio. (See section 3.4.2 below for an analysis of evaluation/feedback factors). Based on the data provided, the weekly evaluation and feedback hours across all colleges averaged 9.5 hours in the fall snapshot, and 8.9 hours in the winter snapshot.

Individual college averages ranged from 2.9 hours (Grands Lacs) to 10.7 hours (Sir Sandford Fleming and St. Clair) in the fall snapshot, and from 2.8 hours (Grands Lacs) to 11.4 hours (Sir Sandford Fleming) in the winter snapshot.

3.1.4 Hours for Complementary Functions

Article 11.01 F provides for a weekly minimum allowance of 5 hours for routine complementary functions. Additional complementary functions may be assigned. Based on the data provided, total weekly hours for complementary functions across all colleges averaged 10.0 hours in the fall snapshot, and 10.3 hours in the winter snapshot.

Individual college averages ranged from 5.2 hours (St. Clair) to 22.6 hours (Grands Lacs) in the fall snapshot, and from 5.3 hours (St. Clair) to 24.8 hours (Grands Lacs) in the winter snapshot.

3.1.5 Total Workload Hours

Article 11.01 B 1 of the agreement states that the total workload shall not exceed 44 hours for any week for which there are teaching contact hours. Article 11.01 J 1 states that maximum overtime is three total workload hours in any one week on a voluntary basis. Based on the data provided, total workload hours for all colleges averaged 41.9 hours in the fall snapshot, and 41.4 hours in the winter snapshot.

Individual college averages ranged from 38.6 (Lambton) to 43.1 (Loyalist) in the fall snapshot, and from 38.9 (Lambton) to 42.9 (Loyalist and Northern) in the winter snapshot.

3.2.1 Teaching Contact Hours - Coordinators Excluded (Table 8.1)

Article 14.03 A 3 defines coordinators as those academic staff members who have responsibility for providing academic leadership in the coordination of courses and/or programs. They receive, in addition to their regular salary, an allowance equal to one or two steps on the appropriate salary scale. In some cases, coordinators may also have a reduced number of teaching contact hours.

The CRC calculated teaching contact hours for all staff, excluding coordinators within each college and then across all colleges. The purpose was to see what effect, if any, the inclusion of coordinators had on the average number of teaching contact hours. For each term, the CRC excluded from the calculation any employee coded as either Coordinator I or Coordinator II. Then CRC excluded any records in which the teaching contact hours were reported as blank or zero.

In the fall snapshot, data for 3,769 regular staff members were used in the calculation. In the winter snapshot, data for 3,713 regular staff members were used. The average number of teaching contact hours among regular staff was:

- X 14.6 hours in the fall snapshot, ranging from a low of 12.6 (Sir Sandford Fleming) to a high of 16.2 (Conestoga),
- X 14.5 hours in the winter snapshot, ranging from a low of 12.6 (Sir Sandford Fleming) to a high of 16.1 (Conestoga).

The average number of teaching contact hours for all staff, including coordinators, in the fall snapshot was 14.1, a difference of .5 hour per week. In the winter snapshot, the average number of teaching contact hours for all staff was 14.0, the difference is also .5 hour per week.

3.2.2 Teaching Contact Hours - Coordinators ONLY (Table 8.2)

The CRC calculated teaching contact hours for coordinators only within each college and then across all colleges.

For each term, the CRC included in the calculation any employee coded as either Coordinator I or Coordinator II. Then CRC excluded any records in which the teaching contact hours were reported as blank or zero.

In the fall snapshot, data for 993 Coordinator records were used in the calculation. In the winter snapshot, data for 921 Coordinator records were used. The average number of teaching contact hours for Coordinators was:

- X 11.9 hours in the fall snapshot, ranging from a low of 4.3 (Boréal) to a high of 16.0 (Cambrian),
- X 11.7 hours in the winter snapshot, ranging from a low of 2.3 (Boréal) to a high of 15.4 (Cambrian and St. Clair).

3.3 Student Contact Hours per Week (Table 9)

The CRC calculated student contact hours per week, within each college and across all colleges. The calculation excluded any individual course data in which either the teaching contact hours or the class size was reported as blank or zero. Within each snapshot, the CRC calculated the student contact hours per course in each college by multiplying the teaching contact hours per course by the number of students in that course. The results of this calculation were summed by academic staff member to arrive at the weekly total teaching contact hours per academic staff member. These were totalled and then divided by the number of academic staff members counted to arrive the average student contact hours per week in each college.

In the fall snapshot, 3,988 academic staff members were included in the calculation. In the winter snapshot, 4,297 academic staff were included. Based on the data provided, the average number of student contact hours per week was:

- X 394.9 hours in the fall snapshot, ranging from a low of 97.8 (Grand Lacs) to a high of 466.0 (St. Clair),
- X 376.9 hours in the winter snapshot, ranging from a low of 149.7 (Boréal) to a high of 477.0 (George Brown).
- X Loyalist College data was excluded because extra course records for time periods outside the snapshot weeks were submitted. It was too time consuming to reconcile this problem.

3.4 Classification of Courses by Type (Tables 10.1, 10.2, 11.1, 11.2)

Preparation and evaluation/feedback time is attributed based on course type and/or class size. The analysis of preparation factors is based on 19,074 courses in the fall snapshot and 19,992 in the winter snapshot. The analysis of evaluation/feedback factors is based on 19,080 courses in the fall snapshot and on 20,016 courses in the winter snapshot. In analysing preparation factors, the CRC excluded data which reported the preparation factor as blank. The same applies to evaluation/feedback factors.

3.4.1 Preparation Factors

Article 11.01 D 1 identifies seven classifications of courses, with preparation factors ranging from 0.35 to 1.10 hours per assigned teaching contact hour. Based on the data provided, the most common type of preparation factor during the two snapshot weeks was *Established B*. In the fall snapshot, 53.5% of courses were designated as *Established B*, ranging from a low of 43.9% (Seneca) to a high of 70.8% (Loyalist). In the winter snapshot, the average was 57.4%, with individual college ranging from 46.4% (Georgian) to 72.7% (Loyalist).

In the fall snapshot, 27.2% of the courses were classified as *Repeat B*, 13.3% were classified as *New*, 4.4% were *Repeat A*, and 1.6% were classified as *Established A*. A small percentage were reported as having special preparation factors. In the winter snapshot, 25.5% of the courses were *Repeat B*, 12.0% were *New*, and 1.6% were *Established A*. Again, a small percentage had special preparation factors.

3.4.2 Evaluation/Feedback Factors

Article 11.01 E 1 identifies three classifications of courses depending upon the type of evaluation/feedback required for students. The most common type of evaluation/feedback is *Combined* (i.e. more than one type of factor used in evaluating and providing feedback to students), at 44.4% in the fall snapshot and 42.4% in the winter snapshot. In the fall snapshot, averages ranged from 0% (Boréal, Grand Lacs) to 94.5% (Confederation). In the winter snapshot, averages varied from 0% (Boréal, Grands Lacs) to 94.4% (Confederation).

The next common type of evaluation/feedback factor is *Essay/Project*. In the fall snapshot, 39.1% of the courses were designated as *Essay/Project*. Among the colleges, the average ranged from a low of 0.3% (Confederation) to a high of 100.0% (Grand Lacs). In the winter snapshot, 39.7% of courses were designated as *Essay/Project*, with individual college averages ranging from 1.1% (Confederation) to 89.1% (Boréal).

In the fall snapshot, 10.9% of courses across all colleges were *Routine/Assisted* and 5.6% were considered as *In-Process*. In the winter snapshot, these percentages were 10.6% and 7.2% respectively across the colleges.

3.5 Class Size (Table 12)

Article 11.01 E 3 addresses class size. No prescribed limits are set out in the agreement, however the size of a class is used in the formula for determining evaluation/feedback time. Thus, it has an impact on the overall workload.

The CRC excluded from the analysis any class sizes which were reported as zero or as a blank. In the fall snapshot, data collection included 19,104 classes and class size across the colleges averaged 30.81. Individual college averages ranged from a low of 12.44 (Grand Lacs) to a high of 44.42 (Sir Sandford Fleming). In the winter snapshot, data recorded 20,030 classes for analysis class size among the colleges averaged 28.93. Among the individual colleges, the average ranged from 16.25 (Boréal) to 39.90 (Sir Sandford Fleming).

The largest class was reported as 370 (St. Clair) in the fall snapshot and 378 (St. Clair) in the winter snapshot. The most frequent provincial college class size is 26-30 for both fall and winter terms. (See Appendix A)

3.6 Course Preparations (Table 13)

Article 11.01 D 2 states that no more than four different course preparations shall be assigned in a given week except by voluntary agreement. Based on the data provided, the system average number of course preparations in the fall snapshot was 2.80. Among individual colleges, the average ranged from 2.32 (Georgian) to 3.72 (Confederation). In the winter snapshot, the average was 2.89 course preparations. Among individual colleges, the average ranged from 2.39 (Seneca) to 3.60 (Confederation).

3.7 Course Sections (Table 14)

Article 11.01 D 2 states that no more than six different course sections shall be assigned in a given week except by voluntary agreement. Based on the data provided, the average number of course sections was 4.28 in the fall snapshot and 4.24 in the winter snapshot. Among individual colleges, the average ranged from 2.50 (Grand Lacs) to 5.36 (St. Clair) in the fall snapshot, and from 2.50 (Grands Lacs) to 5.13 (St. Clair) in the winter snapshot.

3.8 Yearly Totals (Table 15)

The CRC included in the calculations only data for academic staff who had SWFs in both snapshot periods.

3.8.1 Total Teaching Contact Hours

Article 11.01 K 3 of the agreement states that the total teaching contact hours shall not exceed 648 in post-secondary and 760 in non post-secondary programs. The average total teaching contact hours were 451.79. Among individual colleges, the average ranged from a low of 111.40 (Grand Lacs) to a high of 519.44 (Cambrian).

3.8.2 Total Teaching Contact Days

Article 11.01 K 1 states that total teaching contact days should not exceed 180 for post-secondary and 190 for non post-secondary. Based on the data provided, the average total teaching contact days were 161.73. Among individual colleges, the average ranged from 72.50 (Grand Lacs) to 174.43 (Mohawk).

3.8.3 Total Teaching Contact Weeks

Article 11.01 B 1 states that the maximum teaching contact weeks are 36 in post-secondary programs and 38 in non post-secondary programs. Based on the data provided, the average number of teaching contact weeks was 32.96. Among individual colleges, the average ranged from 14.50 (Grand Lacs) to 35.73 (Centennial).

4.0 REPORT TABLES

Table 1	Status of Employee Records
Table 2	Staff by Employee Type
Table 3	Staff by Position (Regular/Coordinator)
Table 4	Staff by Service Status (Non-Probationary, Probationary)
Table 5	Staff by Employee Type and Service Status
Table 6	Reasons for No SWF throughout the Academic Year
Table 7	Workload by Function (Average Hours per Week)
Table 8	Average Teaching Contact Hours per Week - Coordinators Excluded - Coordinators only
Table 9	Student Contact Hours per Week
Table 10	Courses by Type of Preparation Factors
Table 11	Courses by Type of Evaluation/Feedback Factors
Table 12	Distribution of Class Size
Table 13	Course Preparation
Table 14	Course Section
Table 15	Year End Totals - Employees with SWF in Both Snapshots

COLLEGE SPECIFIC 1997-98 SWF DATA COLLECTION

COLLEGE	SWF DATA LIMITATIONS
Cambrian	No sign-off.
Canadore	No NO SWF for YEAR employee records submitted. No sign-off
Conestoga	No Course records submitted for either snapshot 1 or 2.
Confederation	No sign-off.
Durham	Did not submit any SWF data.
George Brown	No NO SWF for YEAR employee records submitted. No Course records submitted for snapshot 1.
Grand Lacs	No Course records submitted for snapshot 2.
Lambton	No NO SWF for YEAR employee records submitted.
Loyalist	900 Aextra@ Course records submitted. This resulted in erroneous statistics in Table 9, these records were omitted. No NO SWF for YEAR employee records submitted. No sign-off.
Mohawk	No NO SWF for YEAR employee records submitted. No sign-off.
Sault	No sign-off.
Seneca	Signed off by Human Resources only.
Sheridan	Did not submit any SWF data.
St. Lawrence	Did not submit any SWF data.

1997-98 CAAT ACADEMIC WORKLOAD SURVEY

**Analysis of Full-Time Academic Staff
Standard Workload Form (SWF) Records:
Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology**

**College Relations Commission
Office of Collective Bargaining Information
Ministry of Labour
400 University Avenue, 9th Floor
Toronto ON M7A 1T7
Telephone: (416) 326-1260
Facsimile: (416) 325-4134**

December 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0	COLLEGE DATA SUBMISSION/PROCESSING.....	1
2.1	College Response.....	1
2.2	Data Verification and Error Checking.....	1
2.3	Data Limitations.....	2
2.4	Classification of Academic Employees.....	3
2.4.1	Type of Employee.....	3
2.4.2	Position of Responsibility: Regular/Coordinator.....	3
2.4.3	Service Status: Probationary/Non-Probationary.....	3
2.4.4	SWF Availability: Reasons for No SWF.....	4
3.0	ANALYSIS OF THE SWF DATA.....	4
3.1	Workload by Function.....	4
3.1.1	Assigned Teaching Contact Hours.....	5
3.1.2	Attributed/Additional Preparation Hours.....	5
3.1.3	Attributed Evaluation and Feedback Hours.....	5
3.1.4	Hours for Complementary Functions.....	6
3.1.5	Total Workload Hours.....	6
3.2.1	Teaching Contact Hours - Coordinators Excluded.....	7
3.2.2	Teaching Contact Hours - Coordinators Only.....	7
3.3	Student Contact Hours per Week.....	8
3.4	Classification of Courses by Type.....	8
3.4.1	Preparation Factors.....	9
3.4.2	Evaluation/Feedback Factors.....	9
3.5	Class Size.....	10
3.6	Course Preparations.....	10
3.7	Course Sections.....	10
3.8	Yearly Totals.....	11
3.8.1	Total Teaching Contact Hours.....	11
3.8.2	Total Teaching Contact Days.....	11
3.8.3	Total Teaching Contact Weeks.....	11
4.0	REPORT TABLES.....	12
APPENDIX	A - Frequency Distribution of Class Size	
	B - College-specific 1997-98 SWF Data Collection	