

CLAS Faculty Workload Policy:
Guidelines for Unit Faculty Workloads

I. Introduction

The College Faculty Workload Policy is based on principles of equity and accountability. Faculty Workload Policies enhance transparency of work assignments in order to ensure faculty, departments/units, and the college are accountable in the treatment of faculty. It has the added benefit of aiding junior and underrepresented faculty groups who might face disadvantages by virtue of informal yet culturally embedded power structures. A Faculty Workload Policy also helps articulate the College's responsibilities and performance to other University units as well as external agencies.

The purpose of the CLAS Faculty Workload Policy is to provide guidelines for the development and implementation of unit level Faculty Workload Policies. In keeping with the University's Faculty Workload Policy, it is recognized that flexibility and deference to department and disciplinary norms are key factors for establishing faculty workload expectations. In an inherently diverse College, it is important to recognize and reward varied faculty practices by establishing guidance principles that allow Departments/Units to function in a manner best suited to their disciplines consistent with College goals.

Workload policies need to be aligned with merit, tenure, and promotion policies, but are not a substitute for those policies. Rather, the Faculty Workload policies provide a structure for ensuring appropriate overall contributions to the university's mission, while the fruits of those contributions are acknowledged and rewarded through merit, tenure, and promotion policies.

The college policy document is intended to provide a foundation; units are expected to develop their own faculty workload policies. This document also notes the ways in which the college is modifying the expectations of the university-level document. Except for those places where such changes from the university-level document are noted, this college-level document is intended to refine and clarify the university-level document and remains subordinate to it. Similarly, except for those places where changes from the college- or university-level documents are noted, unit-level documents will be subordinate to the college- and university-level documents; until they produce their own policies, units will be subject to the college- and university-level documents.

Section II establishes the framework for the process for setting unit-level and individual workload expectations. This process will include justifying teaching load expectations at the unit level relative to the 3-3 baseline established in the University Workload Policy. It also provides guidance on establishing workload expectations for research, service, and engaged learning. Section III indicates specific adjustments to the university workload policy, undertaken to address distinctive missions within the college. At present, two aspects of the college are considered: joint appointments and interdisciplinary teaching; and the teacher certification programs.

II. Process for Setting Workload Expectations

The establishment of individual workload expectations will be a two-step process: first, units and the college office will work together to establish overall workload expectations for the unit's professorial faculty. Then the unit will develop individual workload expectations for individual faculty members, working within the parameters set by the unit-level expectations, as well as the university, college and unit-level policies.

A. Unit-Level Expectations

As part of the foundation for the establishment of individual workload agreements, the College and unit will agree on the overall workload expectations of the unit, and in particular, the professorial faculty of the unit. These unit-level expectations will be reviewed every three years.

Expectations for instructional effort will take the form of minima for instructional effort per faculty FTE, with effort measured by some or all of the following:

- Student credit hours generated
- Sections taught
- Graduate students supervised
- Engaged learning activities supported

These expectations of instructional effort have to be tied to expectations for other activities, particularly research and artistry and engaged learning, but also service to the institution and the profession. The intention is to capture holistically how a unit is fulfilling its mission, and to establish the appropriate level of instructional effort needed to ensure that the overall contribution to the university's mission is commensurate with the (faculty) resources provided. Expectations will be derived from at least two considerations:

- Comparisons to productivity of disciplinary peers. To do so, a set of indicators will be identified and a set of peer comparators will be identified for each unit. The average of those peers' values on the various indicators will form the starting point for setting expectations.
- Limits on budget, space etc. that constrain the faculty to a given size, independent of the unit's performance against peers.

The indicators used to set expectations must be measurable and benchmarked against peers where data are available, and at the same time must be reasonable approximations to our primary values. Some indicators will be common across all units, others will be arrived at by consultation between the department and college. While some indicators used to set expectations will be common across all units, the level of expectation will vary considerably, e.g. units may have significantly varying levels of grantsmanship or community engagement. The common indicators used to set expectations are:

Research & Artistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Publications• Presentations• Artistic Productions• External Funding• Fellowships
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students Graduated• Degrees conferred per SCH

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Credit Hours Generated • Sections Taught • Student Participation in Engaged Learning
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in Governance of Interdisciplinary Units, the College, or the University • Participation in Unit-Level Administrative Activities • Participation in Professional Community Engagement • Service in Professional Organizations

B. Individual Expectations

It is anticipated that units will establish their own procedures for determining workload expectations for individual faculty members. In doing so, the following conditions should be observed:

- Procedures for establishing individual workload should be incorporated in the unit governance documents and are subject to approval by College Council.
- The responsibility for establishing individual workload expectations rests with the chair or director. The chair/director is expected to involve some form of faculty consultation (e.g. consultation with the unit’s personnel committee or executive committee before finalizing workload assignments) in this process.
- The expectation of consultation applies only to the setting of overall workload levels for individuals, and not to specific assignments (e.g. to the determination of how many courses a faculty member will teach, but not to the determination of what those courses will be). Unit chairs and directors will make final individual course workload assignments in the context of unit-level expectations described above in II.A.
- In the first year of implementation, workload levels will be established for all faculty in the unit.
- Unit workload policies should establish how often an individual faculty member’s workload assignment is reviewed and (if appropriate) revised. Workload levels will be reviewed annually for untenured faculty. Workload levels for tenured faculty will be reviewed at least every three to five years, or more frequently if needed to meet overall unit-level expectations.
- It is expected that, for all but new faculty, the setting of workload expectations will be informed by the previous contributions of the faculty member. Unit workload policies should establish the “window” of previous activity to be considered. The College recommends a three to five-year window for all faculty who served the unit for the period chosen.
- In addition to the established workload review cycle, units are also expected to provide individual faculty members with a mechanism to request an adjustment to their workload.

III. Special College Considerations

To protect the welfare of all its departments and centers, the college needs to balance workload across all units to schedule a curriculum that addresses students’ needs. Because curricular needs take precedence over individual faculty preferences, the college expects departments to deliver course work to meet the needs of each unit’s programs, balancing departmental service,

undergraduate, and graduate missions. This overarching concern includes the balancing of needs for discipline based and interdisciplinary programming.

A. Joint Appointments & Interdisciplinary Teaching

For some faculty, the nature of their teaching assignments may be complicated by their holding joint appointments, teaching in interdisciplinary centers, teaching cross-listed or team-taught courses, or being involved with teacher certification programs in their departments. This section outlines how these special circumstances might be handled.

In keeping with our college principle that faculty teaching in interdisciplinary programs not be advantaged or disadvantaged, faculty workload assignments in interdisciplinary programs must be counted towards their overall workload and weighted neither more nor less than comparable assignments in their home department. To achieve this, the faculty member, his/her department chair, and the interdisciplinary unit director need to follow any existing Memorandum of Understanding or, absent such an agreement, establish clear understandings of how a particular course in a particular semester will count. In most situations, faculty who teach courses with interdisciplinary prefixes in the college need to receive credit towards their workload as if the course carried the prefix of their own department.

In scheduling courses that serve interdisciplinary programs, chairs and directors are responsible for determining which faculty have the expertise and pedagogical skills appropriate for interdisciplinary course work. Chairs need to consult with directors of interdisciplinary programs to coordinate the scheduling of such courses. Chairs and directors need to work together to balance the needs of departmental majors, minors, and general education students and the needs of students in the interdisciplinary program. Ideally chairs and directors need to establish viable scheduling patterns for discipline based and interdisciplinary courses and factor those courses into the calculation of individual faculty workload.

Because interdisciplinary programs are sometimes best served by team-taught course work, chairs and directors need to determine the amount of credit faculty members will receive for such assignments. Normally, the allocation of credit will be proportionate to the class time led by each faculty member. The total credit assigned to team taught courses can exceed the equivalent value of a single course, if the chair/director(s) believe(s) that the amount of time required to prepare and to deliver the course warrants it. Cross-listed courses should count the same as standard departmental courses, unless the chair determines that extra preparation and grading warrants granting additional credit.

B. Teacher Licensure

For faculty members involved in our teacher preparation programs, there are special responsibilities that need to be considered in determining workload. Faculty in teacher licensure programs must collect data and write required state and national reports, must keep current on and adjust to changing regulations for teacher certification in the state, and must keep students advised of program changes. Faculty also have to demonstrate their current “contemporary professional experience,” documenting their participation in such required activities as attending and leading workshops with teacher practitioners, addressing problem-based classroom learning situations with practitioners, consulting with school and district personnel, supervising clinical

experiences, and doing field based research. Teacher licensure faculty must be actively engaged in partnership arrangements with the schools, and they must document their currency in middle school and high school classrooms. For some teacher licensure faculty, particularly those who serve as the primary discipline coordinator of the department, there are also heavy committee responsibilities requiring regular attendance and active participation in CITC and its work. In such situations, the chair and the faculty member might consider a different weight of the traditional teaching, scholarship and service responsibilities for the position.

Approved by CLAS College Council January 28, 2013