

## Workload Policy & History

---

Beginning in Spring 1994, a process was established for assignment of faculty load in the following academic year. The policy applies not only to teaching load, but also to research and service contributions, and graduate student advising. A primary goal of the load policy is to establish equity in faculty load (defined primarily in terms of participation in programs and initiatives of the School), in the spirit of fairness, productivity, and citizenship. Such obligations include not only teaching graduate courses but also courses at the undergraduate and masters level, assuming administrative responsibilities within our academic programs, serving on School committees, and working to advance the quality of the School through its programs, research and other contributions. Advising doctoral and non-doctoral students is considered to be a part of teaching responsibilities for the School.

In May 1988, SESP faculty voted into effect a Faculty Workload Policy recommended by the Executive Committee's Strategic Planning Committee Report. While it was never put into effect, it provided the foundation for the present policy for establishing workload for 1994 and beyond. Pertinent motions passed in 1988 were that:

- The expected level of faculty effort for a full-time 9-month appointment should be 12 units of faculty activity, or 1200 hour-units. Each of the 12 units is considered to be approximately 100 hours of faculty time (thus about 1200 hours per 9-month academic year, 400 per quarter, 40 hours per 10 weeks). These are only rough guidelines for purposes of estimation, not for clock-punching.
- At least 5 of the 12 faculty load units should be courses (unless faculty offer letters state otherwise; in such cases other activity units fill out the load assignment each year).
- Each course that a faculty member teaches should be evaluated as one such unit, with these administrative guidelines: Faculty load unit policy established in the early 1980's and carried on by the motions passed in 1988 defined faculty load equivalency in time-based units. In other words, a course is considered to require approximately 100 hours of faculty time, distributed as in 25-30 hours of class contact time, 25-30 hours office and student contact hours, and 40-50 hours of course preparation, grading, and associated record keeping. Any adjustments in unit credit for their course work proposed by a faculty member due to courses taking significantly more time than this benchmark had to be justified empirically and the Dean's office could choose to supply additional help (e.g., TAs) to take up the additional burden without increasing course load credit.
- In 1988, the faculty approved a motion that the composition of faculty loads--teaching and other internal responsibilities--should more systematically involve program area coordinators' input. The 1994-1995 framework for faculty development is a major step in that direction, involving coordinators in curriculum review and discussing special needs.
- In 1988, the faculty approved a motion that the evaluation system for salary review should be modified with respect to criteria, evidence, and decision process. Specifically, greater attention should be given to internal contributions, especially teaching, advising,

chairmanship of major School committees and functioning as a program coordinator. The 1994-1995 framework is a major step in that direction.

As a final note, the University expectation is that 25% of an individual faculty member's load is typically constituted by research activity (including grants development, research conduct and supervision), thus comprising on average three additional load units of faculty activity. This figure may vary with research grant buyouts, and load assignments.

Key details required to implement the 1988 policy were left implicit. Others were available from the planning documents of the Executive Committee in that period. Following are the estimates, in terms of the 1200 hour-units for 100% academic year commitment, which were put into place for the workload assignment system for 1994-1995.

(1) Teaching. As described above.

(2) Graduate student advisement. For each chaired dissertation, 50 hour-units for the academic year; and 1.5 hour-units for participation on each doctoral committee (these figures are from 1988 policy documents).

(3) Research. Load estimates for research involve a total of values for five different categories of unit assignment. These are: (1) grant buyout (of salary); (2) "contributed" grant time as specified in submitted grants; (3) pending grant assignments; (4) grants development; and (5) unfunded research effort. While keeping in mind the University estimate of 25% of faculty time commitment for research, the assignment for the following year is based upon faculty commitments and plans, and the Dean's recommendations regarding effort to devote to grants development. Depending on the situation, more or less time is estimated to be devoted to these five categories of research activity. A brief account of these five categories is provided below.

Salary buyout. When possible in their research grants, faculty are encouraged to buyout a portion of their salary, which then enables a greater proportion of their time to be devoted to research. These funds are then made available for the Dean's assignment to such purposes as hiring alternative instructors for courses and for School funding of graduate student support.

Contributed time. Often grants do not provide for academic year salary but nonetheless fund research costs and affiliated graduate student or research staff support. When submitted, such grants typically require the faculty member to specify the proportion of their academic year time which will be "contributed" to the project. This figure should be reviewed and negotiated as a realistic figure with the Dean before grants are submitted.

Pending grant assignments. Once grants have been submitted, the faculty workload assignment letter from the Dean for the forthcoming year will typically make the default assumption that the award will be forthcoming and that the faculty time is accordingly committed. Should the grant not be awarded during that academic year, the Dean will re-assign faculty to teaching or other assignments to make up that aspect of load assignment.

Grants development. Designing and writing competitive grant proposals is an important but time-consuming process. In acknowledgment of this fact, the Dean works with faculty during

the annual review process to establish a target proportion of their work load which will be devoted to this activity as appropriate given goals of the faculty and of the School.

Unfunded research effort. While it is strongly recommended that faculty seek and secure funding for their research activities, there will be occasions when their work is not supported by research grants. This aspect of workload assignment acknowledges this fact, and characterizes the time expected to be devoted to such unfunded research in the forthcoming academic year.

(4) SESP Service. The service component is comprised of existing School commitments, in terms of elected committees or other arranged responsibilities. Four levels of commitment have been defined to reflect the disparate time involvements and responsibilities involved in SESP service to different committees. These figures have come from past policy or serve as estimates of participation. They will be reviewed after the first year and adapted as necessary.

100 hour-units Program Coordinator

50 hour-units Executive Committee

20 hour-units FPRC, Teacher Education Policy Committee, Undergraduate Education Committee, Technology Committee; ad hoc committees on academic program planning, curriculum changes, as needed.

10 hour-units Honorary Degrees Committee, General Faculty Committee Representative, UFRDTAP, Committee on Committees, URGs, other NU committees, as needed.

Faculty also provide service to the University community in terms of ad-hoc committee work, and unit assignment for such service is negotiated with the Dean during the Spring annual review meeting, based on past experience and best estimates.

As a final note, given the diversity and idiosyncratic nature of faculty service to their profession, in such capacities as conference chair, journal editor, national committees, and the like, no specific provision is made in work assignments for these activities. Instead, they will be taken into account in the merit review process insofar as they serve to indicate excellence and leadership.