

1-23-2019

Development of a Physical Therapy Faculty Workload Measurement Tool

Wanda Nitsch

University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences, wanda.nitsch@gmail.com

Kathleen Manella

University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences, kmanella@usa.edu

Jodi Liphart

University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences, jliphart@usa.edu

Cherie Peters-Brinkerhof

University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences, cpeters-brinkerhoff@usa.edu

Terri Roberts

University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences, troberts@usa.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://soar.usa.edu/education>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Physical Therapy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nitsch, Wanda; Manella, Kathleen; Liphart, Jodi; Peters-Brinkerhof, Cherie; and Roberts, Terri, "Development of a Physical Therapy Faculty Workload Measurement Tool" (2019). *Education Collection*. 4.

<https://soar.usa.edu/education/4>

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty and Staff Research at SOAR @ USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Collection by an authorized administrator of SOAR @ USA. For more information, please contact soar@usa.edu, erobinson@usa.edu.



DEVELOPMENT OF A PHYSICAL THERAPY FACULTY WORKLOAD MEASUREMENT TOOL

Wanda Nitsch, PT, PhD; Kathleen Manella, PT, PhD; Jodi Liphart, PT, DHS; Cherie Peters-Brinkerhoff, PT, EdD; Terri Roberts, OTD, OTR/L

INTRODUCTION

- Counting credit hours is not an equitable way to measure faculty workload in physical therapy education considering online delivery with heavy workloads negatively impacting satisfaction, learning outcomes, and research productivity.
- The University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences (USAHS) is a graduate-level institution in the United States, with seven Doctor of Physical Therapy programs offered in four US locations.
- USAHS faculty workload includes 50% teaching, 20% scholarship, 30% a combination of service, administration, release, and discretionary time.
- The aim of this study was to develop a faculty workload measurement tool that quantifies productivity, was easy to use, and equitable.

METHODS

- Faculty workload taskforce reviewed literature, benchmarked, and gathered data regarding teaching time per course, committee and research time.
- Contact hour-point conversion tables were created in an MS Excel worksheet based on type of delivery method, number of faculty teaching in the course, and number and type of learning assessments completed; aligned with promotion criteria.
- A small pilot of five faculty was completed and adjustments made.
- A two large faculty pilots were completed; data and open-ended responses were used to develop a final version of the workload measurement tool to be fully implemented in late 2018.

RESULTS

- The tool was built for all full-time faculty (1 FTE) with a 100% workload equivalent to 100 points.
- Standardized faculty expectations had to be determined before tool development
- The taskforce developed a workload measurement tool that appears to be accurate, transparent, and impartial.
- With the addition of directions and the self-calculating formulas, the form provides quick, consistent information to faculty and their supervisors regarding division of workload between the four main areas of faculty time.

Teaching Workload

| Course Name | Lecture Points as allocated on Teaching Convert Table | Lecture % contribution all instructor contribution must sum to 100% | Calculation | Lab Points as allocated on Workload Points Table | Lab % contribution each instructor may contribute up to 100% | Calculation | Lead Instructor (enter 2 points) | On-line course. (enter 1.5 points), Blended (enter 0.75 points), Face-to-Face (enter 0) | Number of Trimesters Teaching per year | Sum of Workload Points |
|------------------------------|---|---|-------------|--|--|-------------|----------------------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| Evidence Informed Practice I | 11.25 | 100% | 11.25 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 2 | 0.75 | 3 | 14.75 |
| Movement Science I | 16.88 | 50% | 8.44 | 16.88 | 50% | 16.88 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 18.88 |
| Pharmacology | 11.25 | 100% | 11.25 | 0.00 | 0% | 0.00 | 2 | 1.5 | 3 | 14.00 |

Scholarship

| Scholarship | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 | Level 6 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Faculty Workload Points for each activity | 1.5 | 3 | 4.5 | 6 | 7.5 | 9 |
| Writing or submitted an abstract for poster or platform presentation | X | | | | | |
| Abstract reviewer for a professional conference | X | | | | | |
| Peer reviewer for a manuscript for peer-reviewed publication | | X | | | | |
| Published a professional related article in non-refereed publication | | X | | | | |
| Published book review in peer-reviewed publication | | | X | | | |
| Applied for and received external grant (national or international) | | | | X | | |
| Published case report or case study in peer-reviewed publication | | | | X | | |
| Published research or review article in peer-reviewed publication | | | | | X | |
| Published chapter in scholarly book related to area of expertise | | | | | X | |
| Published a scholarly book (not course manuals or notes) | | | | | | X |
| Received research grant (regional, national, or international) | | | | | | X |

Service

| University Service - Committee Work | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Faculty Workload Points for each activity per trimester | 0.33 | 0.66 | 1 | 1.33 | 1.66 |
| Activity time per trimester | 2 hr | 4 hr | 6 hr | 8 hr | 10 hr |
| Key: Committee Member (X) / Chair (Y) | | | | | |
| Diversity | X | | Y | | |
| Grievance | X | | Y | | |
| Library | X | | Y | | |
| Academic Progression and Retention | | X | | Y | |
| Curriculum | | X | | Y | |
| Educational Effectiveness | | X | | Y | |
| Faculty Development | | X | | Y | |
| Faculty Promotion | | X | | Y | |
| Research | | X | | Y | |
| Co-curricular | | | X | | Y |
| IRB | | | X | | Y |
| University Curriculum and Academic Policy (governance) | | | | X | Y |
| Technology Steering Committee | | | | X | Y |

Professional and Community Service

| Professional or Community Service | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Faculty Workload Points for each activity (per trimester) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Committee member of a local, state or regional professional organization | X | | | |
| Committee member of a national or international professional organization | | X | | |
| Committee Chair of a state, local or regional professional organization | | X | | |
| Committee Chair or appointment to an office of national or international professional organization | | | X | |
| Worked with students on community volunteer project not part of a course | | | | X |
| Board member of a state or regional professional organization | | | X | |
| Board member of a national or international professional organization | | | | X |

Teaching Conversion Table

| Teaching Conversion Table | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Total Points = (Total Hrs X 50 points) / 20 points | | | | |
| Lecture Credit | | | | |
| Credit | Lecture Contact Hours | Grade/Prep Hrs (Factor 1.25) | Total Hrs | Total Points |
| 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.63 | 1.13 | 2.81 |
| 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.25 | 2.25 | 5.63 |
| 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.88 | 3.38 | 8.44 |
| 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 4.50 | 11.25 |
| 2.50 | 2.50 | 3.13 | 5.63 | 14.06 |
| 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 6.75 | 16.88 |
| 3.50 | 3.50 | 4.38 | 7.88 | 19.69 |
| 4.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 9.00 | 22.50 |

Total Faculty Activity

| Appraisal Categories | Workload Points |
|---|-----------------|
| Teaching (target 50 points) | 47.63 |
| Scholarship (target 20 points) | 22 |
| Service/Administration/Release/Discretionary (target 30 points) | 31.5 |
| Total faculty workload points (target 100 points) | 101.13 |

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Two issues arose during the development process that will require additional attention:

- some faculty with high administrative responsibilities need adjusted workload formulas; and
- any curriculum change will require new conversion tables.

Future work will involve adding professional development to the tool and more detailed instructions.

IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study indicate that an equitable measurement of faculty workload in health science programs can be achieved. An accurate and transparent measurement tool can support efficient use of resources, productivity, and faculty satisfaction.

REFERENCES

Cowdery, J. E., Agho, A. (2007). Measuring workload among health education faculty, *Californian Journal of Health Promotion*, 5(3), 73-79.
 DiBiase, D. (2004). The impact of increasing enrollment on faculty workload and student satisfaction overtime. *JALN*, 8(2), 45-60.
 Thomas, E. (2003). The credit hour and faculty instructional workload. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 122, 45 – 55.
 Wilborn, T., Timpe, E., Wu-Pong, S., et al. (2013). Factors influencing faculty perceptions of teaching workload. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), 9-13.



Contact: Dr. Wanda Nitsch:
Wanda.Nitsch@gmail.com