This brief report surveys the various ways in which institutions of higher learning compensate supplemental faculty workload. The survey, which achieved a 91 percent response rate, was conducted of 42 universities enrolling over 18,000 students. The survey asked about the length of academic terms and the methods used to write faculty supplemental contracts for teaching in the Spring or Summer terms. Tables show: academic terms; lengths of periods used for supplemental contract; and compensation methods. Analysis of survey responses found that the majority of institutions used less than half of their full-time faculty to teach beyond the regular academic year. The two main compensation methods used were: (1) percentage of faculty's regular contract for a given period, and (2) percentage of the regular contract per credit hour taught, with the majority using the former method. (CH)
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How faculty are compensated for teaching beyond their regular academic contracts is of special interest for faculty and administrators alike. How their compensation for overload compares to that of colleagues at other institutions can impact morale and influence their willingness to accept overload assignments. If administrators know the different ways institutions compensate faculty for overload assignments they can more effectively provide a system that will help meet faculty expectations and satisfy institutional requirements.

To examine the various ways that institutions of higher learning compensate supplemental faculty workload, a survey was conducted of 42 universities with student enrollment of over 18,000 FTE. The survey requested responses on the length of academic terms and the methods used in writing faculty supplemental contracts for teaching in the Spring or Summer terms. A 91 percent response rate from the 42 institutions revealed a strong interest in this subject.

One of the main reasons for differences in the methods used in determining compensation for overload assignments is the difference in the length of academic terms, depending on whether the institution uses a quarter, semester, or trimester term. The length of an overload assignment is a function of the type of academic term selected by the institution.

The most common academic term for the 42 universities participating in the survey is the semester. Of the respondents to the survey 79 percent of the respondents use this term. Of those institutions using the semester, 64 percent use a 16-week term, with 36 percent using a shortened 15-week semester.

Of the 16 percent of the colleges and universities that use a quarter term, a little more than half, or 57 percent use a 10-week period, compared to 47 percent that use a 11-week period. Only two of the institutions surveyed use a trimester term for their academic year.

The academic terms that are used by the survey participants are indicated below:
Academic Terms:

**Semester** (33 of 42 or 79 %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Period</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 weeks</td>
<td>36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 weeks</td>
<td>64 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quarter** (7 of 42 or 16 %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Period</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 weeks</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The length of the academic year turned out to be the greatest area of similarity among the institutions included in the survey. Of the institutions surveyed, 92 percent indicated using a 9-month calendar, while the remaining 8 percent use a 10-month academic year.

Regarding the use of full-time faculty for supplemental teaching assignments, the survey indicated that only 22 percent use more than half of their faculty for overload teaching appointments. The majority of the institutions use less than half of their faculty to teach beyond the regular academic year.

The length of the periods used for supplemental contracts are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various length from 1 to 3 months</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The results of the survey indicated that institutions determine compensation for supplemental contracts mainly by two methods: (1) using a percentage of the faculty's regular contract for a given period or (2) using a percentage of the regular contract per credit hour taught. The following schedule indicates the methods institutions use to determine compensation for supplemental contracts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/3 of basic contract</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9 of basic contract</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9 of basic contract</td>
<td>14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 % of basic contract per credit hour</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of various criteria</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not included in survey response</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although no specific method seems predominant for determining compensation offered in faculty supplemental contracts, the survey results indicated a tendency to use the basic annual contract as a base. Results of the survey also indicated that the majority of full-time faculty contracts for the regular academic year are written for a term of nine months. The most prevalent method of determining supplemental pay is the combination of 2/9 or 1/9 of the basic annual contract.

The purpose of this study was to provide information on the criteria and methods involved in writing supplemental contracts for faculty overload. Being aware of the methodology and processes used by other institutions of higher learning should help administrators make more informed decisions on ways to compensate faculty for overload assignments.
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