

**POLICY FOR TEACHING BEYOND THE NORMAL
WORKLOAD – LESSONS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF
DODOMA (UDOM)**

Ahmed Mohamed Ame*

Abstract

This paper presents the lessons to be learnt from UDOM experience of mounting a teaching beyond the normal workload policy that was instituted as a strategy to cope with the shortage of teaching staff but still upholding quality and stimulate work morale and retention. The work was based on holistic descriptive case study design supplemented by documentary review. Data analysis was accomplished using qualitative and quantitative means. The result has been the establishment of the required policy having an accepted formula to compute monetary incentive for academic staff approved to have taught above the normal workload. It is hereby suggested to other institutions of higher learning to emulate from UDOM experience in order to improve quality of teaching, eradicate grievances among the teaching staff and launch a powerful retaining strategy.

Key words

Policy, academic staff, teaching, teaching workload

* Directorate of Graduate Studies, The University of Dodoma, Dodoma, Tanzania

1.0 Introduction

The University of Dodoma (UDOM) is a public institution established in March 2007 under the University Act No. 7 of 2005 and the UDOM charter and Rules 2007. It officially started its academic activities in September 2007 with enrollment of the first batch of 1,200 students. The University is expected to be comprehensive and the largest in the country with enrollment of at least 40,000 students when fully established (UDOM Strategic Plan, 2007).

The establishment of UDOM was the response to the growing national recognition of the need for increased access, equity and excellence in higher education. This development is in line with a number of national policies and development frameworks, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Tanzania Vision 2025, The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) and Higher Education Policy.

By 2011, UDOM had made considerable progress in terms of academic programmes, infrastructure and enrollment of students. The table below shows levels of students enrolment from 2007/08 when the University started to 2011/12 academic years.

Table 1: Level of Students Enrolment at UDOM from 2007/08 to 2011/12

Category	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	Total
Undergraduate	1,033	5,869	6,824	4,893	3,745	22,364
Graduate	74	370	513	443	355	1,755
Total	1,107	6,239	7,337	5,336	4,100	24,119

Source: UDOM Admission Office

During 2008/09 academic year where UDOM enrolled 5,869 undergraduate students in 57 degree programmes, enrollment was done in two phases without which many candidates would not have obtained a chance of university education. Students' population at UDOM increased to 20,019 in the academic year 2010/11 in 74 undergraduate and 21 graduate degree programmes. Enrolment has gone down to around 15,500 students in the 2011/2012 academic year. This has been caused by insufficient number of academic staff, inadequate water infrastructure (clean and waste water) among others. It was expected that during the 2012/2013 academic year, student

population would slowly start rising again towards its expected level. On the other side, the number of academic staff increased from about 100 in 2007 to about 300 in year 2009 and further to 540 in year 2010. During 2011/2012, UDOM had 644 academic members of staff (UDOM Strategic Plan, 2012). It was expected that, the number would increase to about 800 in the year 2013.

Due to large enrolment along with numerous academic programmes which together do not correspond to number of academic staff, UDOM experienced increased workload on the side of academic staff. This problem was further widened by factors such as limited number of senior academic staff, running of University-wide compulsory courses (for example, Development Studies, Communication Skills and Information and Communication Technology to large classes of about 5,000 students) and running of elective courses (for example, Human Resources Management, Entrepreneurship Development, etc) which attract many students. It was thus imperative for UDOM to come up with heavy teaching workload plan to reward academic staff accordingly without which dedicated teaching staff would be disappointed. This could further have negative effects on the quality of the academic work at the University.

In an attempt to tackle the challenge of shortage of academic staff, the University has been striving to recruit academic staff from within and outside the country. However, it is generally known that the labour market is in shortage of academic staff particularly at the level of lecturers and above. Due to that, UDOM came up with another sustainable but long term strategy which is to recruit, train and retain junior staff (bachelors and masters degree holders). This category of people is in fact readily available in the labour market. While implementing this long term strategy in terms of training the junior academic staff, the remaining few academic staff became overwhelmed with shouldering the heavy teaching load beyond normal hours. An attempt to rescue the situation was to recruit part time lecturers from various higher learning institutions something that created serious budgetary constraints. This short term strategy was expensive ostensibly because the part timers need to be transported to and from the University, given accommodation for the time they remain teaching at the University, paid subsistence allowance apart from the teaching honoraria. Above all, it is hard to control quality and the teaching arrangement when employing part timers. Thus, the University urgently needed a policy that

would guide rewarding heavy teaching workload without compromising other core functions of the University. Such a policy was to guide allocation, assessment and compensation of extra-teaching workload.

The challenge of coming up with teaching workload policy that guides compensation of extra teaching over and above normal workload is that of setting standards. This is so because there are no common standards accepted and applied by all higher learning institutions across the country (For example, Mzumbe University, 2012; Kuzilwa & Bangu, 2012; UDOM, 2007) or across the globe (Barrett & Barret, 2008; Ocvirk & Sirca, 2012). Considering higher learning institutions in the country, Mzumbe University, for instance, defines a class of 30 students as a standard class size for the purpose of seminars/tutorials, and marking scripts, whereas for the purpose of lectures, a standard class size is taken to be not more than 120 students (Mzumbe University, 2012). UDOM in its strategic plan prescribes 30 students as a standard class size for achieving conducive teaching-learning atmosphere. Other Universities like Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), provides different teaching hours per week according to the ranks of academic staff. This tendency creates discontent among staff because the teaching exercise is the same regardless of the rank of the instructor. Also, it is undisputable fact that, the more senior someone is the less difficult teaching becomes due to built capacity and experience. Therefore, when setting standards to reward heavy teaching workload, concerns on the basis of ranks are uncalled for.

Another dilemma is that standards for teaching workload that induces payment cannot be the same across borders because higher learning institutions operate under different environments and vary in terms of their endowments with regards to teaching and other facilities. For instance, the teaching can highly be simplified with the application of ICT something that reduces teaching work. Things become more complicated given the guidelines provided by Tanzania Commission for Universities - TCU (2012) where teaching load is distributed according to the rank of an academic staff. For example, the guidelines stipulate that; for a Professor to teach eight hours in a week, s/he needs three hours for preparation, whereas a senior lecturer would need only two hours of preparation to teach 10 hours in class. Directives from TCU on the application of OPRAS in performance appraisal is another predicament because other activities

of academic staff are either hard to monitor, already remunerated for or not practical for some ranks. These difficulties have made many higher learning institutions in Tanzania not to have developed such important policy document despite acknowledging its relevance and the existence of heavy teaching workload to academic staff that deserves compensation. This paper attempts to provide the experience of developing a teaching workload policy beyond the normal workload by taking the case of UDOM. It provides lessons that can be emulated in an endeavor to improve quality of teaching and concomitantly motivate and retain teaching staff. In so doing, the study responded to the following specific objectives:

- a) To identify variables that would be used as a standard in developing the policy;
- b) To establish ingredients that would make the policy, and;
- c) To furnish with a formula that would be used to remunerate academic staff with extra work load beyond and above normal teaching load.

2.0 Materials and Methods

This study adopted a holistic descriptive case study design. Selection of the case was based on paradigmatic basis. Actually, when selecting a case for study, researchers often use information-oriented sampling, as opposed to random sampling (Flyvbjerg, 2006). This is because the typical or average case is often not the richest in information. As for the research setting, it was necessary to conduct the study at UDOM because of the need to incorporate the various stakeholders who would benefit from the outcome of the policy. Thus, selection of the research setting was based on suitability because given the problem at hand, UDOM became a test site (Kuhn, 1962).

The study involved data and information collected from three categories of respondents. Senior officials of the University which included Deputy Vice Chancellor who is responsible of Academic, Research and Consultancy as well as that one dealing with Planning, Finance and Administration. Others were Principals of Colleges, Deans of Schools, Heads of Departments, and the Director of Human Resources and Administration. Selection of these individuals was purposively done based on virtue of their positions and the fact that they were information rich. The second category was members of academic staff from various departments who were selected based on opportunity to learn as recommended by Stake (1994). This was adopted

because some few members gave an excuse of time due to their tight schedules especially when they learnt that in depth interviews were required. However, various types of academic staff (males, females, senior, junior, locals and foreigners) were considered as much as circumstances allowed. The third category was the leadership of the University of Dodoma Academic Association (UDOMASA), in which the chairperson and the secretary were separately interviewed. Their selection was again based on the positions they were holding.

Two methods of evidence collection were employed; namely direct interviews with key informants and documentary review. All the informants selected were interviewed using a case study protocol. Apart from direct interviews, various relevant documents to the study were reviewed. However, before data collection, the study protocol was prepared and then pilot tested. As regard to the logic of qualitative research, two methods are suggested for validation, i.e. triangulation of data & methods and respondent validation (Silverman, 1993). For data and methods triangulation, two methods of evidence collection were employed (interview and documentation). In addition, data was gathered from three units of analysis (senior officials, academic staff and academic association leaders). Regarding respondent validation, the report developed was discussed in various meetings starting at departmental level to the final policy making organ of the University where the same people who participated in the study are members. Finally, data analysis was guided by analytic strategy of the study because it is always given priority when choosing the relevant analytic methods (Yin, 1994). Actually, data analysis for the study included the use of summary sheets, pattern matching and memoing, as recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994). In addition, interpretations and implications of comparing information obtained from different units of analysis as well as explanation building were put forward.

3.0 Results and Discussion

This section is devoted for results and discussion as follows:

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Variables Defining Standards

This document defines six variables used as UDOM standards in formulating teaching workload policy. These variables have considered various factors in their development. These are; current and anticipated level of enrolment at UDOM, available physical facilities and the need to train the teaching staff. Others are importance of attracting those who are ready to shoulder extra teaching workload without compromising quality, optimal utilization of human and financial resources, market situation, and quality improvements and maintenance.

Table 2: Variables Defining Standards for Teaching Work Load

Variable	Unit	Amount
Class size (Teaching)	Number of students	300
Class size (Marking)	Number of students	100
Teaching hours per week	Number of hours	15
Extra Teaching hours Workload (ETHW) compensation Rate	Tshs per hour	20,000/=
Class size coefficient (CSC) compensation Rate	Tshs per unit	20,000/=
Examination marking workload (EMW) compensation Rate	Per script above 100	500/=

Legend:

1. Extra Teaching hours Workload per week (ETHW) is defined as:

$$ETHW = Actual\ teaching\ hours - 15$$

2. Class size coefficient (CSC) is defined as:

$$CSC = \frac{Actual\ class\ size - 300}{300}$$

3. Examination Marking Workload (EMW) is defined as:

$$EMW = Number\ of\ Scripts\ marked - 100$$

3.1.1.1 Justification of the standards

- **Class size (Teaching):** Given parameters like teaching facilities, environment, ICT application, etc., higher learning institutions cannot have same definitions of standard class size. In addition, some stakeholders interviewed had indicated that if heavy workload would be

compensated for, a class of 300 students should be normal. For example, one of the interviewees had this to comment with that respect.

“Given the physical facilities at UDOM, current and envisaged application of ICT and expected number of enrolment when the University is fully established, considering 300 students should be a normal class for teaching purposes. Handling more than 300 students should be an event that attracts reward.”

- **Class size (Marking):** The biggest concern of various stakeholders when it comes to handling large class is not that of teaching in class but the issue of marking the tests, assignments and examinations. Evidence from discussion with majority of academic staff showed readiness to handle large classes with regard to teaching. The concern they had was that; there should be two standards when it comes to handling big classes; one for teaching and the other for marking. While the standard class size for teaching is 300, that one for marking was proposed and accepted to be 100 by all stakeholders.
- **Teaching hours per week:** Working hours for government institutions are known to be 40 per week – equivalent to 8 hours per working day. For the case of teaching however, considerable time is required in the preparation of classes than that time used for delivery in class especially for junior staff. In addition, setting of tests, examinations, assignments and their marking is part and parcel of the work of teachers. These require considerable amount of time to accomplish. Apart from that, academic staff are required to supervise students, conduct research and provide consultancy services to the public. Due to that, UDOM defines 15 hours as standard teaching load per week regardless of the rank of academic staff. Thus, compensation for extra teaching hours would be made if one taught for more than 15 hours in a week.
- **ETHW Compensation Rate:** The University approved teaching rate paid to part timers is Tshs 25,000/= per hour. However, this amount considers many things to include motivating part timers to come from distant places to teach at UDOM. It was thus found modest to reward academic staff little bit lower than the part timers when they teach beyond normal hours. The amount recommended and accepted was Tshs 20,000/= per each extra hour.

- **CSC Compensation Rate:** The CSC was simply given the same weight as the hourly teaching rate of Tshs 20,000/=. This implies that for every 300 students on top of the normal class of 300, instructors would be remunerated Tshs 20,000 per semester leave aside payment based on extra teaching hours and examination marking workload.
- **EMW Compensation Rate:** EMW of Tshs 500 per script was based on some institutions like National Board of Accountants and Auditors (NBAA), Institute of Finance Management (IFM), and others which use to handle many students per session. This rate had earlier been approved and applied at UDOM to remunerate markers.

The foregoing defined standards called for three elements that formed the basis of compensation resulting from extra teaching workload. These are:

- a) Teaching above 15 hours per week;
- b) Handling more than 300 students in a semester, and;
- c) Marking more than 100 final examination scripts during a semester.

3.1.2 Policy components

The policy was made up of seven components which are policy principles, policy objectives, policy implementation instruments and organs, and policy teaching activities. Others are policy remuneration procedure, work load policy management and policy assumptions.

Policy Principles

The teaching work load policy is governed by the following five principles:

- a) Teaching is among the major functions of the University.
- b) The six core values of the University (Excellence, accountability and transparency, Moral standards and integrity, innovation, equity and partnership) are observed in performing the teaching activity by all academic staff.
- c) Human and physical resources are efficiently and effectively utilized to achieve the teaching objectives of UDOM.
- d) Teaching workload allocation and rewarding processes in Schools are fair and transparent.

- e) Academic staff are highly motivated to perform quality teaching function at UDOM.

Policy Objectives

The extra teaching workload policy at UDOM is based on the following four objectives:

- a) To ensure quality teaching at the University of Dodoma;
- b) To ensure effective utilization of human and physical resources of the University of Dodoma;
- c) To facilitate Schools in planning and assigning of teaching workload to academic staff, and;
- d) To motivate academic staff with extra teaching workload.

Policy Implementation Instruments and Organs

- a) The policy uses financial remuneration as the instrument to implement it.
- b) Staff members confirmed to have extra teaching workload shall be paid allowances as may be determined and approved by Council from time to time.
- c) Implementers of the policy are Colleges through their respective Schools and Departments.

Policy Teaching Activities

Teaching responsibilities in the context of this policy encompass the following range of activities:

- a) Preparation of lectures.
- b) Delivery of lectures.
- c) Preparation and conduct of tutorials.
- d) Preparation and supervision of practical classes.
- e) Setting and marking of assignments, tests and examinations.
- f) Compilation of continuous assessment and examination results.

Policy Remuneration procedure

- (i) Academic staff that exceeds the normal teaching workload claim for payment by filling the extra-workload claim form.

- (ii) The extra teaching work load is compensated at the end of the teaching semester and does not include the evening based programmes. It is done after timely submission of the examination results of the course(s) under consideration.
- (iii) Payment follows the financial regulations after approval by the College Principal through Deans and Heads of respective Schools and Departments respectively.
- (iv) Heads of Departments keep all the teaching records for the academic staff in their respective Departments. The records are submitted together with the extra-workload claim form in order to effect payment.
- (v) The amount to be paid is according to the computation done in the formula put forward as the response for objective 3 (clause 3.1.3).

Work load Policy Management

- To ensure effective and efficient utilization of human and physical resources, Deans of each School establish an academic work load committee.
- School Workload Committee comprises Dean of School and elected academic staff to represent each teaching department within the School.
- The workload committee ensures fair allocation of workload to academic staff and fair remuneration for actual extra work load performed.

Policy Assumptions

The policy is based on the following assumptions:

- Seminar sessions have been assumed to have 100 students;
- Lecture sessions accommodate up to 300 students per sitting;
- All classes having less than 900 students cannot attract more than 15 hours of teaching per week. This is so because, there will be 3×2 lecture hours plus 9 seminar sessions = 15 contact hours per week. However, in running such classes, reward emanating from handling of big classes and examination marking extra load are provided;
- All courses registering 300 students and below will only attract examination marking workload;

- Instructors having teaching of many courses to the extent of acceding 300 students will be paid class size coefficient workload and examination marking workload even if they may not have compensation with regard to teaching hours workload, and;
- The treatment of remuneration arising from large classes per se and that one resulting from accumulation of many classes is the same.

3.1.3 Workload Policy Remuneration Formula

As discussed under 3.1.1.1, compensation resulted from extra teaching workload at UDOM was based on three parameters defined as:

- Extra Teaching Hours Workload (ETHW);
- Class size coefficient (CSC), and;
- Examination Marking Workload (EMW).

Thus, the formula that is used to compute the remuneration in terms of Tanzanian Shillings is given by:

$$ETWC = 20,000 \times ETHW + 20,000 \times CSC + 500 \times EMW$$

Where, ETWC stands for Extra Teaching Workload Compensation. This formula has been translated into an EXCEL worksheet modus operandi given by:

Table 3: Compensation Formula Based on Excel worksheet

Course Code	Number of Students	Number of lectures per week	Number of seminars per week	Total hours per week	Compensation Items			Compensation for the Semester
					THW	CSC	EMW	
A9	B9	C9	D9	E9	F9	G9	H9	I9

Where:

Number of lectures per week is obtained from: =IF(B9<600, 2, (B9*2)/300);

Number of seminars per week is defined by: =B9/100;

Total hours per week is computed as: =C9+D9;

THW is computed from: =IF(B9<900, 0, E9-15);

CSC is determined as: =IF(B9<=300, 0, (B9-300)/300);

EMW is calculated by $=IF(B9 \leq 100, 0, B9-100)$, and;

Compensation for the semester is obtained by: $=F9*20000+20000+G9+H9*500$.

Note that the formulae were based at Excel worksheet row 9.

3.2 Discussion

This workload policy and procedures document was designed to support the core mission of UDOM. Operationalization of this policy was an acknowledgement of the teaching work done by academic staff over and above the normal workload. It is understood that academic endeavor is challenging such that much workload can negatively affect the quality and effectiveness of teachers while too little workload is not efficient in human and physical resources utilization.

The amount of work performed by an individual in many government institutions is conventionally measured by the time spent on performing it. Recently, there have been some changes to include the aspect of output. However, in academic work, time and output alone cannot effectively be used to judge the amount of work that has been performed. This is because apart from implementing the actual class teaching, an academician has to make some preparations, set assignments, tests and examinations and mark thereafter. An academician has other responsibilities of research and consultancy such that in most cases their total work done is far beyond the official working hours set by the government or respective institutions. The aspect of output is of a long term and cannot also depend on the part of students.

If beyond normal workload is not recognized and rewarded, academic staff may be demoralized consequently resulting in poor performance. The need to recognize and reward heavy workload of academic staff is extremely important for a young and growing institution like UDOM which is considerably constrained by limited number of senior academic staff. Even for old and well established Universities, the move should be well directed.

In designing such a policy however, it is important to consider three important things:

- Such policies should focus only on teaching activities because other academic functions such as research and consultancies are automatically rewarded by their nature. The main

objective of the teaching workload policy should be to provide framework for ensuring that academic staff are fairly compensated and motivated from the teaching function so that they can efficiently and effectively perform their duties with this regard. The policy should not be considered as a method of distributing a supplementary income to everyone who engages in teaching. That is, those who will not engage in teaching beyond normal workload due o their other duties (senior academic staff and academic administrators) should be covered under the policy.

- Definition of variables making standards can be hard to achieve. Experience from other institutions, market environment and prevailing conditions at the institution are important considerations in arriving at the standards.
- When proposing compensation, it is important to consider today and not tomorrow. If people contemplate of tomorrow, it is not possible to achieve optimality. Once compensation starts, it is possible to review the rates using appropriate organs as conditions may allow.

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

This section puts down the conclusion and recommendations derived from the findings.

4.1 Conclusion

Establishment and implementation of teaching workload policy has many advantages to higher learning institutions. These include among others; improvement of teaching quality, narrowing the gap of inadequate teaching staff, reducing the need of part time lecturers and minimize costs there from, and works as a human resource retention mechanism.

Improvement of teaching quality arises by having committed workers who are ready to spend more time to work anticipating more payment to meet their other objectives. It has been documented that majority of employees in organizations nowadays join organizations primarily because of fulfilling their personal objectives (Ngirwa, 2006). So, if means and ways to fulfill personal objectives of employees are facilitated, why not working hard?

Narrowing the gap of inadequate teaching staff emanates from people willingness to shoulder more teaching than usual. This becomes possible due to anticipated extra remuneration by

employees. Experience shows that many instructors at higher learning institutions get employed as part timers elsewhere. If people can be utilized at home institutions using motivating rates, they should welcome such a move because it reduces numerous risks and costs like travelling, requesting for permissions, wasting of time, etc.

Reducing the need of part time lecturers results from academic staff readiness to support the mission of their institution to the required tune ostensibly because compensation is there. If compensation is not anticipated, the same people would stick to normal teaching load whose outcome should be usage of part timers. The use of part timers increases cost of operation and denies the institution capacity and possibility to monitor quality of the programmes. For the case of UDOM for instance, it is estimated that the annual cost of operationalizing the policy is only about 50% of the total amount needed to employ instructors on part time basis. The costs accrued from accommodation, traveling, subsistence and incidentals of part timers can be escaped.

Finally, the policy functioning as retention strategy works out through provision of supplementary income that makes the young staff live rather comfortably. In fact, if the institution is not fair and transparent in allocating the teaching work, there is possibility of introducing misunderstanding among staff and between their leaders because everyone would want to have a portion of extra teaching workload. Adoption of workload management strategy therefore, is modest way of achieving impartiality and equity in teaching allocation in Higher Education Institutions.

4.2 Recommendations

It is hereby recommended that higher learning institutions go ahead to prepare and institute teaching beyond normal workload policy. The policy has many advantages which include but not limited to enhancing teaching quality, lessening the gap of inadequate teaching staff, reducing the need of part time lecturers, optimizing operation costs, eliminating complaints among the teaching staff and introducing a powerful retention instrument.

References

Bent Flyvbjerg (2006), "Five Misunderstandings about Case Study Research", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 12, no. 2, 219 – 245.

Joseph A. Kuzilwa, J.A. & Bangu, N. (2012), *Challenges in Workload Allocation Models and Human Resource Management in Universities*, A paper presented during the 4th Higher Education Forum, Naura Springs Hotel, Arusha. September 2012.

Kuhn, T.S. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miles, Matthew B. and Huberman A. M. (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, (Second Edition), Sage Publications, International Educational and Professional Publisher, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.

Mzumbe University (2012), *Workload Policy and Operational Guidelines for Teaching Staff*.

Ngirwa, C. A. (2006), "Human Resources Management in African Work Organizations", Unpublished Manuscript, Faculty of Commerce and Management, University of Dar es Salaam.

Ocvirk, A. and Sirca, N. T., (2012), *Academic workload management towards learning, components of academic work: a case study*, *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, Vol.11, No.3, 268 – 287.

Silverman, David (1993), *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysis Talk, Text and Interaction*, SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

Stake, Robert E. (1998), "Case Studies" In *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), Sage Publications, International Educational and Professional Publisher, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.

TCU (2012), *Employment, Staff Performance Review and Career Development: Minimum Guidelines*.

UDOM (2007), *Strategic Plan 2007 – 2012*.

UDOM (2012), *Strategic Plan 2012 – 2017*.

Yin, Robert K. (1994), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, (Second Edition), Sage Publications, International Educational and Professional Publisher, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.