



JOURNAL OF
TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING

A Longitudinal Assessment of Academic Time Allocation

Author(s): Gail L. Grabowsky and Jace Hargis

Source: Grabowsky, G. L., & Hargis, J. (2015). A longitudinal assessment of academic time allocation. *Journal of Transformative Learning*, 3(2), 37-51.

Published by: University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond: OK

URL: jotl.uco.edu

The *Journal of Transformative Learning* is an Open Access journal at jotl.uco.edu.
The *Journal* is dedicated to the application and practice of transformation in higher education.

A longitudinal assessment of academic time allocation

GAIL L. GRABOWSKY¹ AND JACE HARGIS²

Chaminade University

Abstract

This purpose of this paper is to explore the concept of time and its relationship to the three major tenets of the professoriate, research, teaching, and service. Although there are several types of higher education institutions, all have at least one attribute in common, which is a limited time. In an era where we are asked to do more with less, the idea of identifying sufficient time to accomplish our passion becomes an enduring challenge. In this paper, we provide a semester of empirical data collected over a decade ago, when additional scholarship was first required. The results indicated at the time that at least one Assistant Professor had insufficient time to accomplish the additional requirements. Over the past ten years, the university has taken a number of steps to encourage more scholarship and transformative learning; however, recent discussions with faculty reveal that many of the same challenges persist. The point of this research is not to use data to demonstrate ill-conceived institutional strategies, as most agreed there was a need for enhanced scholarship at our educator-scholar institution. Instead, the results demonstrate a need for further prioritization, organization, and alignment of appropriate scholarship, which could include the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, which addresses transformative learning.

Introduction

Twelve years ago, as a 50-year-old small liberal arts university, we engaged in the noble task of taking the next steps on our philosophical path of continual improvement. There were many changes that clearly constituted improvements, which included

- renovated learning spaces;
- new buildings;
- an updated general education curriculum;
- an expanding service learning program;
- an intensive student retention study;
- an increase in academic assessment;
- key new hires; and
- renewed attention to our university mission and *Core Academic Beliefs (Education for Formation in Faith; Integral Quality Education, Education and the Family Spirit; Education for Service, Peace and Justice; Education for Adaptation and Change)*.

¹ Gail Grabowsky, Ph.D., is Associate Professor at Chaminade University in Environmental Studies. She has helped advise on policy and education as a member of the Advisory Council for the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve, now known as Papahānaumokuākea National Marine Monument, a World Heritage site in Hawaii. 3140 Waiālae Avenue - Honolulu, HI 96816 USA ggrabows@chaminade.edu

² Jace Hargis, Ph.D., is currently the Associate Provost of Faculty Development, Assessment and Research and Professor at Chaminade University Honolulu. Dr. Hargis' research agenda focuses on how people learn through the use of emerging instructional technologies. jace.hargis@gmail.com

Over the same period, our student enrollment had nearly doubled. Few people on campus doubted that a causal correlation existed between the efforts to improve and our increased enrollments. In the wake of this success, the university community was enlivened and continued to engage in efforts to identify ways to improve our institution. The reiterating process inevitably began with discussions across campus, aiming to identify the next most critical improvements.

Even though the faculty members were extremely busy, they remained upbeat. They were highly collegial and student-focused and shared their talents widely across the academic and local community. Somehow, most of them even identified a way to balance their busy schedules and found time to enjoy their family, recreate, attend to outside interests and have a life. Along with above satisfactory student perceptions, faculty retention was high, thereby developing a rich institutional culture and history.

At this time, a relatively new President began to mandate additional scholarship requirements, on top of a current 4/4 course load requirement. Although there were many conversations on the effect this would have on student attention, the quality of teaching and life balance, the university stakeholders decided to move forward.

As scientists, our approach to problem solving is to collect data. In this case, the primary concept of importance was time. Additional scholarly responsibilities meant additional time was needed. Since faculty were already very busy with a heavy teaching load and service to the community, an alternative method for acceptable, appropriate scholarship, which aligned with the university educator-scholar mission, was explored. At the time, the President suggested Boyer's (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered model as a potential for transformative learning. The thought was that since teaching load was high, faculty had many opportunities to gather a substantial amount of data on student interaction, teaching and learning, service learning, community partnerships, etc., with various instructional methods.

Boyer (1990) had redefined scholarship in four distinctive ways, which included the Scholarship of Discovery; Integration; Application; and Teaching and Learning (SoTL). After reviewing this model, it was agreed by everyone that the Boyer model for scholarship aligned well with the university mission. To concretely represent this new approach and to provide clarity, examples of each scholarship type were prepared and made available in the faculty handbook approved by the Faculty Senate:

1. Examples of the *Scholarship of Discovery* may be drawn from the sciences, such as the development or characterization of materials, the exploration of physical phenomena, and the extension of mathematical theorems. Across the disciplines, many types of empirical research, involving the use of quantitative techniques from the social sciences, fall within the Scholarship of Discovery. Work in the humanities that is sufficiently original that it cannot fairly be regarded as merely interpretive, interdisciplinary, or an extension of the work of others may constitute the Scholarship of Discovery.
2. Interdisciplinary works, such as those, which use economic or psychological analysis, may qualify as *Scholarship of Integration*. The same is true of evaluative and interpretive works, such as review essays, which probe the merits of another's work from a particular viewpoint, such as an interdisciplinary, religious, political, or gender-based perspective.
3. Examples of the *Scholarship of Application* include such diverse forms of scholarship as drafts of model legislation; educational standards; articles and books examining the legal,

economic, or ethical implications of new social phenomena; editorials and opinion pieces involving issues in one's discipline or invited book reviews in professional journals; and certain types of research in the applied sciences.

4. Examples of the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)* include publications about pedagogy and methodology; empirical assessment of learning outcomes; development and publication of instructional materials; the development, presentation and evaluation of workshops on innovative teaching methods; and the creation and publication of computer exercises in areas relating to one's discipline.

Many faculty members saw this new breadth of acceptable types of scholarship as a welcome flexibility that could help us meet the recently intensified scholarship requirement. It could also result in more scholarship that helped the university gain a better understanding of teaching and learning, and it enabled faculty to gain credit for scholarship that benefits the community. Faculty were more optimistic about the use of their time now that they could interpret their area of scholarly focus and create suitable material that could be accepted in peer-reviewed journals.

After more than a decade of the Boyer approach, through discussions with faculty and review of annual reports, it is not clear that an increase in published scholarship occurred. However, most faculty members remained happy, and many continued their work at the university. One hypothesis for the lack of increase in scholarship is that a key ingredient for systemic change was missing. The university and faculty concluded that the piece that was missing is a facilitator of the Boyer model. To address this issue, an Associate Provost (AP) of Faculty Development, Assessment and Research was hired. During the first several months, the AP met with faculty one on one and in small groups and began to interpret, facilitate and mentor the emphasis of Boyer's Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) model into helping faculty develop manuscripts.

Although faculty members somehow managed to transform their teaching and learning and developed creative ways to incorporate research before the arrival of a new AP, many admitted they were in need of new ideas and assistance. The institutional transformative culture was clear and obvious to new arrivals and was reinvigorated through open discussions with the AP, which served as a reminder of the extent of their transformation, as well as a catalyst for new projects fertile for transformation.

Prior to the arrival of the new AP, the university offered faculty development, which included

- a Faculty Development Fund;
- summer incentive money to complete scholarship; and
- assistance for grant writing.

The Responsibilities for the AP position include:

- Faculty development, including determining appropriate support, resources, programming, and training to facilitate faculty growth in all areas of their professional roles and expanding research and sponsored programs;

- Overseeing academic assessment and accreditation;
- Ensuring that quality mentoring and development support are provided to faculty to enhance learning and teaching, both online and face-to-face;
- Supporting and developing the research capacity and endeavors of faculty;
- Coordinating assessment activities for on-ground and online teaching and learning;
- Providing leadership in faculty development by designing, implementing and assessing a comprehensive program of faculty development to assist faculty at all career stages;
- Organizing development events, workshops, programs, faculty learning communities, and conferences designed to improve scholarship and teaching and transformative learning;
- Organizing activities to stimulate and support faculty to seek external support;
- Administering funds to support faculty to initiate, publish and present research;
- Coordinating with Faculty Senate the development and implementation of a meaningful and sustained New Faculty Orientation;
- Coordinating program review activities and maintain a program review schedule;
- Enhancing teaching effectiveness by consulting with individual faculty to facilitate growth in appropriate pedagogy, curriculum design, and assessment of student learning;
- Creating a culture of teaching excellence and a viable environment for the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL);
- Assisting in the use of data to improve student learning and for grant development;
- Acting as liaison between PI and the Business Office Grant Specialist and is the main point of contact for the senior sponsored research consultant;
- Overseeing sponsored projects development and administration;
- Supervising contract and grant administration, including processing of non-competing continuations, supplements, award amendments, monitoring, and modification; and
- Consulting with Deans regarding faculty development needs and issues.

Literature Review

Faculty Development

Faculty development is a broad term used in many different ways in higher education. Traditionally, this term has meant sabbaticals, conference travel funds and, perhaps, a summer or educational technology small grant (Saroyan, & Amundsen, 2004). A significant change of funding received by universities has had a direct and rapid impact on the amount of faculty development resources. This change has created a substantial shift in perspective towards faculty development in many universities and a search for a creative, cost-efficient solution. Although there is no magic bullet answer, some faculty development centers have created internal expertise and regional conferences and have capitalized on online professional development opportunities, such as webinars, micro-blogging (Twitter), Professional Learning Networks, MOOCs, Google Hangouts, and Open Educational Resources (OER) (Hargis, & Soto, 2015).

Many faculty members, both new and experienced, are feeling a shift of responsibilities and expectations in the academe, perhaps without a correlating increase in faculty development resources (Austin, 2002). This is particularly pronounced in teaching-oriented schools, where faculty are often not trained in social science experimental design endeavors and/or have insufficient time to address complex in-depth discipline-based research. In addition, increased

scholarship is expected from traditional teaching institutions, which often mandate a minimum scholarly output for promotion and tenure. Therefore, to maintain academic qualifications in an active academic environment, engaging in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) could offer a viable opportunity for peer-reviewed, publicly disseminated research, typically accepted by most university promotion and tenure committees (Dall'Alba, & Sandberg, 2006).

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

A SoTL research agenda could be an opportunity to collaborate coalitions around mutually shared research agendas with the goal of producing quality work, developing scholarly competence, and facilitating the creation of interdisciplinary research teams (Yee & Hargis, 2012). In general, given the new demands of scholarship placed on institutions and the reality that faculty need to be concerned with the concept of being “tenurable” regardless of individual institutional requirements, provides a unique opportunity for universities to provide guidance to faculty that may result in shared collaborative work and building supportive coalitions (Hargis, 2014). However, one of the major challenges for SoTL is institutional acceptance, especially when faculty are being considered for promotion and tenure advancement. There are still many universities that classify SoTL under the category of Teaching when reviewing a tenure dossier (Trigwell, & Shale, 2004). This approach demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of scholarship as well as marginalizing both the academies primary goal and perhaps one of our most significant weaknesses. The pioneers in the area of promoting SoTL are typically the smaller private liberal arts universities, who can secure talents instructors and researchers as well as are held more accountable for student success due to higher tuition costs driving higher expectations (McKinney, 2007). In other words, these institutions cannot afford to sidestep the responsibility of educating each student and ensuring they secure the knowledge, skills and dispositions to be practice, ready graduates.

Transformative Learning

One of the major researchers in the development and integration of transformational learning, Mezirow (1981) capitalized on many of the powerful ways in which foundation learning theory clearly demonstrates how we learn. Clark (1993) further defined transformation learning as learning that encourages a more extensive change in the learner, especially experiences, which fundamentally shape the learners perspective and create a lasting effect to their future experiences and actions. We realize that changes in perspective occur naturally throughout one’s life, highly dependent on experiences. The power of our research is that it incorporates an extended timeframe of over a decade, during which significant changes took place, which provided multiple opportunities for perspective modification. Mezirow’s (1997) work aligns well with our timeframe as he notes that we do not make transformational changes when new experiences fit comfortably within our current references. This philosophy aligns with what we know about learning principles from Piaget (1974), who described early learning behavior regarding disequilibrium, resulting in either accommodation or acclimation. Human nature has existed on a balance of maintaining comfort, and courageous explorers (such as educators) risk their comfort to transform the world. Daloz (1999) operationalizes this risk in the terms of transformational learning with the metaphor

of transformation as a journey, where risks are an essential aspect of transformative growth. The conclusions drawn from this research transformed the first author by giving her the confidence to believe that indeed she was being asked to do more than there was time to do, rather than her continuing to question her personal abilities. This transformational knowledge allowed her to look at the challenges in a new light and devise new personal solutions along with those of the institution. In retrospect, the disequilibrium that this ten-year journey engendered catalyzed new possibilities such as the hiring of our Associate Provost, who has now brought to campus an increased awareness of and enthusiasm for SoTL as a means of accommodating our heightened scholarship requirements. This expanded opportunity has at once ameliorated our time-issues, made us more effective educators and granted us a strengthened identity as faculty educators at a small liberal arts institution.

Methods

This case study was conducted using two participants who are instructors at the university and are

- educated as research scientists, having earned their doctorates at Carnegie Classified Research I institutions;
- conducting scholarly research throughout their professional academic careers;
- hired with substantial publications in well-respected peer-reviewed journals;
- supportive of the teacher-scholar model, wherein research supports, and enhances instruction; and
- aware of the time required for quality research.

The primary author could not identify sufficient time to accomplish the level of scholarship that had been idealized. This time allocation case study was designed to test the time hypothesis.

Beginning on August 26, 2002, and ending on December 13, 2002 (16 weeks), the primary author maintained a personal work log, recording all of her work-related activities each day, including evenings and weekends. Activities were written in detail initially and placed into one of sixteen categories once the data was summarized. The sixteen categories and the description of the kinds of activities fall into each are described below:

- In Class – Time spent in a classroom or laboratory teaching students.
- Class Preparation – Time spent preparing for a class.
- Grading – Includes any activity spent measuring, evaluating and/or assigning a grade to a paper, exam, homework, project or presentation, etc.
- Meeting with Students – Includes all time spent meeting with students outside of class.
- Advising – Includes all time spent meeting with students about their course loads for upcoming semesters.
- Committee Meetings – Includes all time spent in university committee and community-based committee meetings that pertain to the author's profession.
- Service Learning – Includes all time spent in the field conducting service learning activities and time spent setting up activities with various agencies.

- Assessment – Includes all time spent on assessment activities of any kind, which could be course, program, institutional or accreditation related.
- Grants – Includes all time spent investigating, preparing and administering grants.
- Student Research – Includes all time-spent meeting or in the field with students conducting research and all time spent corresponding with other scientists about student research projects.
- Scholarship – Includes all time spent doing research, developing research projects and attempting to write-up completed research.
- E-Mail Correspondence – Includes all time spent reading and responding to emails about anything related to work.
- General Administrative – Includes all time spent on the phone, talking in person and working on paperwork that pertains to the everyday business of being a professor and is not part of course curriculum.
- Program Administration – Includes all time spent administering and working on projects for the Environmental Studies Program.
- Ordering Supplies – Includes all time spent ordering and buying supplies for the Environmental Studies Program.
- Collegial Conversation – Includes all time spent talking on the phone or in person to other faculty and professionals that do not pertain specifically to any of the other categories, and is an integral part of being a collegial part of the academic community.

The quantitative data from the logs were entered into, manipulated and summarized using a standard spreadsheet software program. All data were double-checked with the log once entered to reduce error. Data were summarized for each category, for each week, and for the semester as a whole.

The second set of different qualitative data was collected in 2015, 13 years after the initial project began, when a new Associate Provost (AP) of Faculty Development, Assessment, and Research position was created in the university. New faculty development opportunities were used to collect the qualitative data:

- Mentoring and one-on-one support for faculty preparing Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) manuscripts
- New Faculty Orientation (NFO) and ongoing support
- Teaching, Learning and Assessment Conferences
- Teaching, Learning, and Assessment in Higher Education Certificate Programs
- Blended, Online and Mobile Teaching, Learning and Assessment in Higher Education Certificate Programs
- Faculty Fellowships (teaching and assessment)
- Faculty Fellowships (grant writing and research)
- Adjunct Instructor Weekend Retreat
- Summer Course Redesign Program
- Accreditation Assessment Leadership program
- Conference travel funds

During the initial three months of employment, in an attempt to become familiar with the campus culture, the new AP met with 75% of the 106 faculty members one-on-one and/or in small groups. The faculty were selected randomly and across all disciplines. The questions were open-ended and allowed for a broad response. The new AP was not aware of the data collected in this study 13 years earlier.

Results

Table 1 summarizes the data for each of the 16 weeks it was recorded for the entire Fall, 2002 semester. Raw data for each week showing how time was spent on a day-to-day basis are presented in Appendix 1.

Table 1. Summary table explaining how time was spent on a weekly basis and for the semester overall. All units in minutes unless otherwise specified.

Week	Work Days	In-Class	Prep	Grading	Student Meetings	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess
1	5	885	685	30	240	160	60	120	40
2	4	930	430	120	50	40	60	605	60
3	5	720	495	0	100	0	330	680	30
4	5	690	330	110	45	0	340	615	150
5	5	840	480	475	160	0	60	230	130
6	5	840	535	265	30	20	0	450	345
7	5	690	370	0	60	0	285	60	360
8	4	720	430	220	65	0	60	405	60
9	5	915	295	220	130	0	60	435	130
10	5	765	510	430	90	0	165	170	0
11	5	870	485	0	90	0	75	120	0
12	4	630	290	255	30	60	375	465	75
13	5	1080	365	360	60	60	60	550	60
14	3	450	255	420	50	30	45	60	0
15	5	635	885	210	45	0	0	75	90
16	5	330	150	285	120	0	420	30	90
Minute s	75	11990	6990	3400	1365	370	2395	5070	1620
Hours	-	199.8	116.5	56.7	22.8	6.2	39.9	84.5	27.0
%	-	25.3	14.8	7.2	2.9	0.8	5.1	10.7	3.4

Week	Grants	Student Research	Scholar	Email	Gen Admin	Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	Total	Hours Worked
1	0	0	0	225	125	115	60	65	2810	46.8
2	30	80	45	220	160	0	0	50	2880	48.0
3	0	0	0	105	180	240	0	105	2985	49.8
4	90	90	60	155	80	495	0	65	3315	55.3
5	120	30	140	105	35	195	120	15	3135	52.3
6	0	60	155	150	60	0	0	135	3045	50.8
7	30	75	290	325	190	145	45	30	2955	49.3
8	1220	110	120	120	120	120	0	30	3800	63.3
9	100	60	190	225	225	60	0	0	3045	50.8
10	30	90	60	265	195	0	0	15	2785	46.4
11	0	255	0	160	105	395	300	15	2870	47.8
12	0	575	0	270	90	0	210	0	3325	55.4
13	30	60	0	255	110	0	0	30	3080	51.3
14	360	85	210	195	45	40	0	30	2275	37.9
15	15	45	0	180	105	75	165	45	2570	42.8
16	0	180	360	180	105	150	60	30	2490	41.5
Minutes	2025	1795	1630	3135	1930	2030	960	660	47365	789.4
Hours	33.8	29.9	27.2	52.3	32.2	33.8	16.0	11.0	789.4	-
%	4.3	3.8	3.4	6.6	4.1	4.3	2.0	1.4	-	-

Assess = Assessment; Scholar = Scholarship; General Admin = General Administrative; ENV Program Admin = ENV Program Administration; Collegial Conv = Collegial Conversation.

TOTAL = Total minutes worked per week and overall

HOURS WORKED = Total hours worked per week and overall

The total number of official work days for which data were recorded was 75. Three weeks - Week 2, Week 8 and Week 12 - contained only four official work days. Week 14, Thanksgiving Break, contained three official working days. Thus, the 75-day work period covers a 16, and not a 15, week period. The co-author worked for a total of 789.4 hours over the 75-day period. This amounts to an average of 10.5 working hours per working day or 52.6 hours per five-day work week. If she had worked 40 hours for each 5-day work week over a 75 work-day period, the total hours worked would have been 600 hours. Thus, the co-author worked 189.4 additional hours over the 75-day period. 189.4 hours amounts to an extra 4.7 forty-hour work weeks.

Additionally, 428.9 of the 789.4 hours, or 54.3% of the co-author's time, was spent performing teaching-related activities represented by the data in the following columns in Table 1: In Class, Class Prep, Grading, Meeting with Students, Advising, and Assessment. These 428.9

hours would constitute 71.5% of her time if she worked a 40-hour week over the 16-week period. If we add the time spent addressing General Administrative duties, ENV Administrative, Ordering Supplies and attending Committee Meetings (Table 1) to the total hours worked performing teaching-related duties, to total comes to 550.8 hours or 69.8% of her total working time. These 550.8 hours would constitute 91.8% of her time if she worked a 40-hour week over the 16-week period.

If the amount of time spent reading and responding to emails is added to the total for teaching and institutional duties the overall total rises to 603.1 hours or 76.4% of the total working time. These 603.1 hours would constitute slightly over 100% of the faculty member's time had she worked a 40-hour week over the 16-week period. Note that the 603.1 hours does not include any time spent preparing for or conducting service activities, in which we are required to engage in at our institution, nor any time spent pursuing grants, collegial conversations with colleagues, helping students conduct research and most important: time spent doing scholarship.

Each of those activities - service, collegiality, student research, and scholarship - take the hours-worked total over the 600-hour mark, meaning they required the co-author to work more than a full-time job. Service learning activities required 84.5 hours. Student research-related activities required 29.9 hours. Grant writing required 33.8 hours. Time spent talking with colleagues took 11.0 hours, only 41 minutes a week. Moreover, finally, time spent on scholarly pursuits, working on research designs, gathering data for existing studies and preparing papers for publication took up 27.2 hours. Again, any one of these activities takes the personal total above the 600 hour, "full time" mark.

Direct qualitative data collected by the new Associate Provost was summarized independently and without knowledge of the data collected by the faculty member 13 years previously. The data was categorized into the following trends, in order of frequency:

- Great place to work, collegial faculty members
- Wonderful students
- High workload and expectations
- Insufficient time for scholarship
- Low pay
- Lack of faculty development
- Assessment unorganized and disconnected from teaching and learning
- Research almost non-existent and not supported

Conclusion

At our university, like many other small liberal arts universities, we are expected to focus foremost on our teaching, and we are asked to teach a substantial number of courses. Achieving tenure and promotion is based mainly on our teaching excellence. Although effective teaching is necessary, it is not sufficient to secure tenure. We must also successfully engage in service to the university and community, collegiality and scholarship if we are going to secure promotion and tenure. More than ten years ago we were required to step up both the frequency and quality of our scholarly accomplishments. Fortunately, the university did have the foresight to allow for a broader definition of scholarship even if the gold-standard remained the peer-reviewed

publication. The results of this study produced enlightening and useful data for the authors and the institution.

Clearly, the endeavor to identify changes that might bring further success was a worthy one. However, any decision to take action and engage in a particular process with a particular end in mind should be made with great care. It is very possible that a university community could initiate a process, aimed at bringing about positive change,

1. without being certain that the university has the means and mechanisms in place to achieve the end; and/or
2. without clear evidence that the ends will bring greater success to the institution.

The results of the time-allocation study empirically demonstrate that teaching four courses in one semester requires over 70% of a full-time work schedule. *Thirty-three percent of a 600 hour semester or 25% of the 789.4 hours worked, were spent in the classroom alone.* The remainder of the time spent on teaching went into preparing for classes, grading papers, meeting with students, assessing courses and advising students. These instructional activities are baseline requirements. Class preparation is essential to achieving and maintaining teaching excellence. Time must be spent grading papers and exams. The primary author of this time-allocation case study is a science professor; a strong argument can be made that grading papers, rather than science exams, requires even more time. Time spent helping students during office hours is one of the touted hallmarks of a small liberal arts college. The faculty handbook requires a minimum of six office hours per week for each full-time faculty member. Assessment cannot ever be ignored. Finally, advising students is essential to keep them on educational track and connected to their academic disciplines.

In addition to the 70% of time spent on teaching-related activities, the 121.9 hours or 20% of a 600 hour semester spent conducting administrative duties, ordering supplies and attending committee meetings are also impossible to avoid if one is to be a productive, helpful and organized member of the university community. Thus, 90% of the semester's full-time hours were spent teaching, administering and participating in university affairs. *This leaves 49.2 total hours or 3.1 hours per week, for all the other important activities: grant writing, service, collegial interactions, and of course scholarship.* Simply doing what it takes to teach four classes each semester and be an active participating member of the university community is very nearly a full-time job.

Although nonparallel methodology and data collection was produced between the initial exploration of this study and revisiting the topic, it seems clear that the challenge of time remains. We believe this is chronic across all academic institutions, perhaps somewhat more exasperated at institutions, such as ours, which are small and where a few faculty must wear many hats. We do believe that there are plausible solutions, which are currently being explored.

Further Work

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) may best align with the mission of the university, the expectations of additional research and the time constraints. One of the powerful aspects of SoTL research is the ability to generalize into other learning settings because of our opportunity to gather more data. Therefore, our faculty can capitalize on the high number of classes they teach with appropriate experimental design models, to collect rich student learning data. Therefore, SoTL could be an efficiency model worth examining at our university, but its implementation cannot simply be added to existing duties. The time and extent of these solutions will depend on how well we can discuss potential compromises as an academic community.

As an outcome of this study, we would like to see our institution search for additional realistic solutions which will allow us to continue to transition to a way of being that includes a more scholarly faculty. Simply announcing that we need to do more scholarship and even broadening its definition are not enough to bring about the change. Many faculty currently desire to engage in more scholarship. We are not prevented from doing so by laziness or a lack of time-management skills. We are hindered by a lack of time and resources, including human capital, as this study indicates.

References

- Austin, A. E. (2002). Creating a bridge to the future: preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. *Review of Higher Education, 26*, 119- 144.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, M. C. (1993). Transformational learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 57*, 47-56.
- Dall'Alba, G., & Sandberg, J. (2006). Unveiling professional development: A critical review of stage models. *Review of Educational Research, 76*, 383-412.
- Daloz, L.A. (1999). *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hargis, J. (2014). A ten-year study of faculty classroom observations. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal, 7*(2).
- Hargis, J., & Soto, M. (2015). Embracing the critical issues in higher education. *Journal of Science Education, 2*(16).
- McKinney, K. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning: The challenges and joys of juggling*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. D. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 32(1), 3-24.

Mezirow, J. D. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 74, 5-12.

Piaget, J. (1974). Cognitive development in children: The Piaget papers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 2, 170-230.

Saroyan, A., & Amundsen, C. (Eds.) (2004). *Rethinking teaching in higher education: From a course design workshop to a framework for faculty development*. Virginia: Stylus Pub.

Trigwell, K., & Shale, S. (2004). Student learning and the scholarship of university teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(4), 523-536.

Yee, K., & Hargis, J. (2012). Indirect faculty development and the role of sociability. *Journal of Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 4, 61-79.

Appendix 1

Assessment Self Study -- How One Professor Spent Their Time: Fall, 2002 Academic Semester

Data:		TYPES OF ACTIVITIES																		
DATE		(data in minutes)																		
Week	Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED	
8/26/2002	9:00 - 6:00	120	210		75			30					45		30		30	540	9.00	
8/27/2002	9:00 - 6:40	180	125		80	100		15	10				30	15	15		15	580	9.67	
8/28/2002	9:00 - 6:00	255	130	30	30	10							30					540	9.00	
8/29/2002	8:45 - 7:00	180	160		55	50							100	20	40		20	625	10.42	
8/30/2002	10:00 - 4:50	150	30				60	75						90				405	6.75	
SAT 8/31/2002			30						30							60		120	2.00	
TOTALS:		885	685	30	240	160	60	120	40	0	0		225	125	115	60	65	2810	46.83	
HOL 9/2/2002			60															60	1.00	
9/3/2002	8:30 - 6:20	180	150	10	20	10			60	30			25	85				570	9.50	
9/4/2002	9:45 - 7:00	330	85	20	15	30											15	555	9.25	
9/5/2002	9:00 - 6:10	180	30		90			140			50		30				35	550	9.17	
9/6/2002	9:45 - 5:45	240	105		15		60						90	30				480	8.00	
SAT 9/7/2002	8:00 - 3:45							465										465	7.75	
SUN 9/8/2002										30	45	80	45					200	3.33	
TOTALS:		930	430	120	50	40	60	605	60	30	80	45	220	160	0	0	50	2880	48.00	
9/9/2002	9:00 - 5:45	120	60		70		60	125					15	45			30	525	8.75	
9/10/2002	9:00 - 7:00	180	210		30			90					60	30				600	10.00	
9/11/2002	10:00 - 5:45	60	60				210	45					15	30			45	465	7.75	
9/12/2002	9:00 - 6:00	180	60					30					25	60	195			540	9.00	
9/13/2002	9:30 - 4:15	180	45				60		30					15	45		30	495	8.25	
SAT 9/14/2002	8:00 - 2:30							390										390	6.50	
SUN 9/15/2002			60															60	1.00	
TOTALS:		720	495	0	100	0	330	680	30	0	0	0	105	180	240	0	105	2985	49.75	
9/16/2002	7:00 - 9:00	60	60		15		130		120		90		30				50	555	9.25	
9/17/2002	7:45 - 6:00	180	60	110	30		60				60		50	50	15			615	10.25	
9/18/2002	9:00 - 6:00	270	60					45	90				45	60			15	540	9.00	
9/19/2002	4:00 - 6:00	180	150				150		30				30	30				570	9.50	
9/20/2002	9:00 - 5:45							105							420			525	8.75	
SAT 9/21/2002	8:00 - 4:30							510										510	8.50	
TOTALS:		690	330	110	45	0	340	615	150	90	90	60	155	80	495	0	65	3315	55.25	
9/23/2002	9:30 - 5:45	120	15	100				20	55	30		50		15	90			495	8.25	
9/24/2002	7:45 - 6:00	180	120		85			15	45	90			60	20				615	10.25	
9/25/2002	10:00 - 6:00	180	270		30													480	8.00	
9/26/2002	9:00 - 6:00	180	75	180	15									75			15	540	9.00	
9/27/2002	10:45 - 6:00	180			30		60		30		30		45	30	30			435	7.25	
SAT 9/28/2002	8:15 - 5:45				195			195			90					90		570	9.50	
TOTALS:		840	480	475	160	0	60	230	130	120	30	140	105	35	195	120	15	3135	52.25	
9/30/2002	9:45 - 5:45	60	80		15			15			30		45	30			30	480	8.00	
10/1/2002	8:00 - 5:30	180	150	120				15					30	45	15			450	7.50	
10/2/2002	10:00 - 5:45	240	145		20						30							465	7.75	
10/3/2002	9:30 - 6:00	180	30	70				60			30		60	50			30	510	8.50	
10/4/2002	10:15 - 6:15	180	15		15				210				30	30				480	8.00	
SAT 10/5/2002	8:00 - 5:00							375	135									540	9.00	
TOTALS:		840	535	265	30	20	0	450	345	0	60	155	150	60	0	0	135	3045	50.75	
10/7/2002	9:30 - 5:45	60	80					15		150			70	45	60	30		495	8.25	
10/8/2002	8:15 - 5:45	180	85	75	30			60			105	45	25	25	15			570	9.50	
10/9/2002	4:00 - 5:00	60	30		30		210	45			60	75	30	30	15			555	9.25	
10/10/2002	9:30 - 5:45	180	90					60	30				60	75	60			495	8.25	
10/11/2002	9:30 - 5:30	210	85				75		50				30				30	480	8.00	
SAT 10/12/2002	1:30 - 7:30							115			15	50	75	60	45			360	6.00	
TOTALS:		690	370	0	60	0	285	60	360	30	75	290	325	190	145	45	30	2955	49.25	
HOL 10/14/2002	2:45 - 6:30		75					15	30				90	60	45			315	5.25	
10/15/2002	8:00 - 5:45	180	205						30		80	30	30	15	15			585	9.75	
10/16/2002	8:30 - 5:45	180	75	220	20						30							555	9.25	
10/17/2002	9:00 - 6:15	180	30		30				150	30			30	30	105		30	555	9.25	
10/18/2002	11:00 - 5:30	180	45		15		60		60				30					390	6.50	
SAT 10/19/2002	8:00 - 5:30							390			180							570	9.50	
SUN 10/20/2002	10:00 - 11:50 PM										830							830	13.83	
TOTALS:		720	430	220	65	0	60	405	60	1220	110	120	120	120	120	0	30	3800	63.33	
10/21/2002	9:30 - 5:30	60	60					15	115	90			90	15	15			480	8.00	
10/22/2002	9:15 - 6:00	180	105	80	70					60			30					525	8.75	
10/23/2002	9:00 - 5:45	285	60	45	30				15	10			35	45				525	8.75	
10/24/2002	8:00 - 5:45	180	10	95	30								90	60	45			585	9.75	
10/25/2002	10:00 - 5:30	210	120				60						60					450	7.50	
SAT 10/26/2002	8:30 - 4:30							420						60				480	8.00	
TOTALS:		915	295	220	130	0	60	435	130	100	60	190	225	225	60	0	0	3045	50.75	

Week 10		Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED
10/28/2002	10:00 - 6:40	60	60	355		45													520	8.67
10/29/2002	9:15 - 5:45	180	255			15						60							510	8.50
10/30/2002	9:00 - 5:30	120	75	75				45			30	30	60	30	45				510	8.50
10/31/2002	9:00 - 5:30	180	90			30			20					85	90			15	510	8.50
11/1/2002	9:00 - 5:45	225	30					120	30					60	60				525	8.75
SAT 11/2/2002	9:00 - 12:30								120					90					210	3.50
TOTALS:		765	510	430	90	0	0	165	170	0	30	90	60	265	195	0	0	15	2785	46.42

Week 11		Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED
11/4/2002	8:45 - 6:00	60	135			15		30	30			180		90	15				555	9.25
ELEC 11/5/02	9:00 - 4:00	180	120			45			30			45							420	7.00
11/6/2002	8:45 - 5:30	270												60	30	120	30	15	525	8.75
11/7/2002	8:00 - 5:30	180	60			30								10	30	260			570	9.50
11/8/2002	10:15 - 5:50	180	170					45	15					30	30	15			455	7.58
SAT 11/9/02	10:15 - 4:00								45			30					270		345	5.75
TOTALS:		870	485	0	90	0	0	75	120	0	0	255	0	160	105	395	300	15	2870	47.83

Week 12		Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED
HOL 11/11/2002	9:00 - 6:00				180							270					90		540	9.00
11/12/2002	8:15 - 5:45	180	70	45	30				30			140		60	15				570	9.50
11/13/2002	8:20 - 10:30	60	30					255	30			30		60					465	7.75
11/14/2003	7:45 - 5:40	180	115	30			60			75				60	15				595	9.92
PREGI 11/15/02	9:30 - 5:30	210	75					60				15		60	30		30		480	8.00
SAT 11/16/2002	6:45 - 4:00								405					30	30		90		555	9.25
SUN 11/17/2002	2:30 - 4:30											120							120	2.00
TOTALS:		630	290	255	30	60	60	375	465	75	0	575	0	270	90	0	210	0	3325	55.42

Week 13		Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED
11/18/2002	10:00 - 8:45	210	105	15			45					15		30	15				465	7.75
11/19/2002	8:30 - 4:30	180	30	180			15		15			30		15	15				480	8.00
11/20/2002	8:15 - 5:45	240	105	150										60	15				570	9.50
11/21/2002	9:30 - 5:30	180	60			60				60	30			60	30				480	8.00
11/22/2002	8:15 - 5:50	270	65	15				60	25			15		90	35				575	9.58
SAT 11/23/2002	8:00 - 4:30								510										510	8.50
TOTALS:		1080	365	360	60	60	60	60	550	60	30	60	0	255	110	0	0	30	3080	51.33

Week 14		Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED	
11/25/2002	8:15 - 5:30	60	15	285					30			60		90					555	9.25	
11/26/2002	9:00 - 5:30	180	30	90	30	30		45	30			30		75	15	15		15	510	8.50	
11/27/2002	10:30 - 5:45	210	75			20						25		30					435	7.25	
TURKEY DAY																					
HOL 11/29/02	11:20 - 5:45		15	45								60	210	30		25			385	6.42	
SAT 11/30/2002	10:00 - 12:00		120																120	2.00	
SUN 12/1/2002	1:00 - 5:30											270							270	4.50	
TOTALS:		450	255	420	50	30	45	60	0	360	85	210	195	45	40	0	0	30	2275	37.92	

Week 15		Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED
12/2/2002	9:30 - 5:45	60	165							90	15			30	15		120		495	8.25
12/3/2002	9:00 - 5:45	180	195						15			45		30		15	45		525	8.75
12/4/2002	10:00 - 4:30	110	160											75	45				390	6.50
12/5/2002	8:45 - 4:30	180	75						30					45	45	60			435	7.25
12/6/2002	9:45 - 5:50	105	290			45												45	485	8.08
SAT 12/7/2002	9:00 - 1:00				210				30										240	4.00
TOTALS:		635	885	210	45	0	0	75	90	15	45	0	180	180	105	75	165	45	2570	42.83

Week 16		Hours	In Class	Class Prep	Grading	Meeting with Student(s)	Advising	Committee Meetings	Service Learning	Assess	Grants	Student Research	Schol	E-mail Correspond	General Admin	ENV Program Admin	Ordering Supplies	Collegial Conv	TOTAL	HOURS WORKED
12/9/2002	8:00 - 6:30	120	90	105								120	165					30	630	10.50
12/10/2002	8:00 - 6:00	120	30						30				120	60	75				435	7.25
12/11/2002	8:00 - 9:45	90	30	120				240					75						555	9.25
12/12/2002	9:15 - 4:15							180				60		30		150			420	7.00
12/13/2002	10:00 - 11:30 - 6:00			60	120					90				90	30		60		450	7.50
TOTALS:		330	150	285	120	0	0	420	30	90	0	180	360	180	105	150	60	30	2490	41.50