

Faculty Workload Guidelines in the Institute of Technology, UWT

Approved by the Institute faculty on February 11, 2011

Rationale

The goal of a faculty workload policy or set of guidelines is to express formally what we collectively value in terms of faculty work. A clear policy or set of guidelines in a program will help the Director, who is formally responsible for teaching and service assignments to faculty, make equitable decisions. No policy or set of guidelines can fully capture the subtleties of faculty workload. Rather, the goal here is to ensure that the load of any faculty does not deviate significantly from accepted norms without some good reason.

The AAUP's "Statement on Faculty Workload with Interpretive Comments" suggests maximum and preferred teaching loads for faculty. The guidelines here are consistent with those suggestions. The Statement also suggests a general method by which workload is determined.

The faculty should participate fully in the determination of workload policy, both initially and in all subsequent reappraisals. Reappraisal at regular intervals is essential, in order that older patterns of faculty responsibility may be adjusted to changes in the institution's size, structure, academic programs, and facilities. Current policy and practices should be made known clearly to all faculty members, including those new to the institution each year.

The individual may have several quite different duties, some of which may be highly specialized, and the weight of these duties may vary strikingly at different times during the year. It is important, therefore, that individual workloads be determined by, or in consultation with, the department or other academic unit most familiar with the demands involved. Those responsible should be allowed a measure of latitude in making individual assignments, and care should be taken that all of the individual's services to the institution are considered.

This document is an implementation of the AAUP suggestion for the Institute of Technology at the University of Washington Tacoma. With a few exceptions, this document describes teaching and service workloads only. The expectation is that with the teaching and service workload described here, faculty will have enough time to pursue their scholarship. This document is intended to be used as a guide for teaching and service assignments, as these are the areas where assignments are made collectively. *It is not intended to be a substitute for other program and University processes*, such as: the annual review process, collegial evaluation of teaching, determination of merit, and the tenure and promotion process.

Each full-time faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, lecturer) will be expected to have a teaching and service load commensurate with the position: C = 6 for tenured and tenure-track, and C = 7 for lecturers. Activities earn "credit" based on the type of activity. The primary factors that are used to determine the credit amounts are the revenue that such activities create for the university and the time it takes for a faculty member to execute that activity.

List of Credit-bearing Activities

What follows is a list of teaching activities and the credit associated with each one.

1. 300- or 400-level 5-unit lecture course (meets 4-5 hours per week) with no TA. With n as the number of students in the course, we assign the credit for the course as follows:

for $n \leq 11$, $C = 0.6$,
for $11 < n < 57$, $C = (10 + (1/6)n) / 15$, and
for $n \geq 57$, $C = 1.3$,

Rationale

The credit is based on the faculty spending 15 hours per week for a 30-student class:
5 hours per week in class,
5 hours of grading and emailing students per week, and
5 hours of prep and office hours per week.

Since increase in class size only increases the time for grading and emailing students, the total hours per week is $H = 10$ hours per week + $(1/6)n$, where n is the number of students. $C = H/15$ is the credit.

The rationale for the cutoffs (11 and 57) are as follows:

1. Any enrollment below a certain number still requires a certain amount of preparation time. However, very small classes (e.g., 8 or fewer) should strongly discouraged or cancelled.
2. We do not want to reward large classes, despite their economic advantages, because the quality of instruction will tend to be poorer.

Implementation

The 10th day enrollment will be used to determine n .

Every tenure-track and tenured faculty member shall teach at least three basic (5-unit lecture) courses per year (i.e., the equivalent of 15 units of lecture courses per year), with the possible exception of sabbatical years and years with a research quarter (for third-year tenure-track faculty). Full-time Lecturers shall teach at least four such courses per year (i.e., the equivalent 20 units of lecture courses per year).

2. Lab-based courses (i.e., the course has a lecture and a formal scheduled lab time, such as TCSS 142 and 143). Earns the same credit as a lecture course with the same number of credits, plus 0.1. *Rationale:* Lab courses require 2 to 3 more hours of faculty time in the lab than a corresponding lecture course.
3. Freshman and sophomore-level (100- and 200-level) lecture courses, but not TCSS 142 and 143. Earns the same credit as a lecture course with the same number of credits, plus 10%. *Rationale:* Freshman and sophomore courses require more attention to pedagogy and require a bit more faculty time in responding to students than an upper division course.
4. Writing-intensive (designated W) courses (e.g., TCSS 325). Earns the same credit as a lecture course with the same number of credits, plus 10%. *Rationale:* The 10% adjustment is based on the 22-student cap that IAS uses for composition courses. Note that a 22-student writing-intensive course earns nearly the same credit (1.002) as a 30-student upper division lecture course (1.0).
5. Seminar courses (e.g., TCES 101, TCSS 598). Earns the same credit as a lecture course with the same number of credits. *Rationale:* The number of faculty hours spent is approximately equal to that of a equal-credit lecture course.
6. Graduate lecture courses (500-level). Earns the same credit as a lecture course with the same number of credits, plus 20%. *Rationale:* The 20% is based on two facts: teaching graduate

courses tends to require keeping up with developments in the discipline, and the tuition for graduate students is higher than that for undergraduates.

7. A course that has TA support. Deduct 0.2 from the credit. *Rationale:* Having a TA saves the faculty in charge of the course nearly all of the grading time. Note that a 45-student lecture course with a TA earns nearly the same credit (0.967) as a 30-student upper division lecture course (1.0).
8. Txxx 390 workshops: In general, managing m workshops with facilitators in a quarter, regardless of program, earns $m/12$ credits, with a lower bound of 0.1. For example, managing the four CSS workshops with facilitators earns 0.333 credits. Managing the CES workshop with facilitators earns 0.1 credit. Managing the two ITS workshops with a facilitator earns 0.167 credits. Managing all 7 workshops with facilitators earns 0.583 credits. *Rationale:* Managing the four CSS workshops takes about 4 hours per week, plus the time at the beginning and end of the quarter for hiring, training, and other administration.
9. Directed readings, directed research (Txxx 498, 499, 600). Earns 0.1 credit for each 5-credit directed study (pro-rated for fewer credits). NOTE: Having a number of independent studies in the same term with essentially the same set of readings or project is *not* in the spirit of these guidelines. If there are, say, 10 students who all want to learn the same material, there should be a course for such a topic. If independent study is the only way to achieve this, then these directed studies should count as follows: 10 students (50 student-credits) = 0.6 credits (just as a lecture course), 9 = 0.54 credits, 8 = 0.48 credits, ... (linearly), 3 = 0.18 credits, 2 = 0.14 credits, 1 (5 student-credits) = 0.1 credits.
Rationale: We recognize that directed studies provide learning opportunities to students outside the curriculum. However, they are not as cost-effective as lecture courses. Thus, the faculty load credit is a compromise between the time faculty spends on a directed study (about 2.5 hours per week, or 1/6 that of a lecture course) and the fact that it does not generate the same revenue as a lecture course (1/30 the revenue but 1/10 the credit when compared to a 30-student lecture course).
Implementation: Consistent with previous policy in the Institute regarding directed studies, all artifacts of directed studies (reports, project summaries, etc.) shall be part of the supervising faculty's annual report. The name and title of the directed study should be listed. Directed readings that do not have any artifacts reported will not count toward the individual faculty's credit.
10. Faculty supervision of internship (Txxx 497, 701). Earns 0.05 credit for each 5-credit directed study (pro-rated for fewer credits). As with directed studies, artifacts from the internship, such as the Colloquium presentation, shall be included in the sponsoring faculty's annual report to be awarded credit. The name and title of the internship should be listed.
11. Masters thesis/project supervision. The Chair of the committee earns 0.125 per 5 student-credits, and a non-Chair earns 0.05 per 5 student-credits. A single thesis/project cannot earn more than 0.25 (chair) or 0.1 (non-chair) for a faculty member. *Rationale:* Although the credit awarded is not commensurate with the revenue generated, supervising masters projects and theses is an important activity of Graduate Faculty. The Chair of the committee has responsibilities that go beyond that of other members. It may be that the intellectual responsibilities are evenly divided among committee members, but *generally speaking*, the Chair takes on the brunt of work in a thesis/project. *Implementation:* The name and title of the masters thesis/project should be listed in the faculty member's annual report. If a

different allocation of the credit is justified, some mention of it should be made in the annual reports of all involved.

12. No more than 1.0 in credit shall be awarded in any one academic year for any one faculty member for directed readings, directed research, internships, and masters thesis/project supervision (collectively).
13. Co-located courses (e.g., typically an undergraduate course with a graduate course) are to be treated as a single course with an enrollment equal to the sum of the enrollments in the individual courses.
14. Non-5-unit courses or courses that do not fit any of the categories above will be assigned credit according to which category that best describes it and will be pro-rated according to the number of credits. For example, a 3-unit short course in CSS would earn 60% the credit as a 5-unit upper division lecture course.

NOTE: Faculty are expected occasionally to teach courses that are new preps. Although a new prep *could* count for more credit than a regular course, there are difficulties with determining how much credit should be assigned. Therefore, it is up to the collective faculty to distribute new preps equitably or to decide collectively how many credits a new prep is worth, perhaps on a case-by-case basis.

NOTE: this arrangement does not take into account the quality of teaching, nor does it intend to. Instructors can put more or less time and effort into a course based on their own standards (as with scholarship).

Departmental and University Service Obligations

In general, it is responsibility of both the Director and individual faculty to be sure that service obligations are not too burdensome. However, there are often immediate needs of the program that need attending. It is up to faculty to collectively decide how to distribute routine service obligations (e.g., through a session at Retreat or faculty meeting).

- Institute committees. Consideration should be given regarding relatively more time-intensive committees (e.g., undergraduate and graduate committees) vs. less time-intensive committees and service at different levels (departmental, university, faculty/Director/staff searches, and tenure committees)
- participating in the process to assign courses to faculty
- admissions (undergraduate, graduate)
- managing student workers (e.g., mentors)
- hosting visiting scholars or organizing guest lectures

Tenured, tenure-track, and full-time lecturers should all contribute to departmental service efforts. As a guide to the Director and faculty, generally speaking, service obligations should be around 2 hours per week.

Course buy-outs

There are generally accepted ways to earn credit without engaging in teaching.

1. UWT Faculty Assembly Chair (3) or Vice-Chair (1)

2. Chair of any of the UWT Faculty Assembly Standing Committees (T&P, Academic Policy, Faculty Affairs, Curriculum) (1)
3. Professional service (reviewing papers for a journal, conference, or workshop (0), editorial board of a journal (0.2), editor-in-chief of a journal (1), chairing a conference (1), other significant conference organization role (e.g., local chair) (0.5))
4. Grant buy-out (variable, based on the terms of the grant; the grant must have explicitly allocated funds for a teaching buy-out and have appropriate approval from the Director and the VCAA)
5. Third-year research quarter (for tenure-track faculty) (2)
6. Other administrative duties (to be determined by the whole faculty according to the activities undertaken)

Credit for activities other than these should be petitioned by the faculty member to the full faculty. Generally speaking, the full faculty should be receptive to new activities that have the potential to contribute to the department, although how much credit is assigned is expected to be determined by faculty consensus.

Tenure-track faculty

There will be no formal special consideration for tenure-track (i.e., pre-tenure) faculty for workload. However, as a general guide, the following mechanisms can be used to ease the teaching and service workload of faculty in their pre-tenure stage:

1. Assigning fewer new prep courses.
2. Lighter committee/service work.
3. Assigning a lighter course load during the first year.

Implementation

As a general guide, each faculty member should have a load that is within 10% of the expected load (i.e., $C = 6$ for tenured and tenure-track, and $C = 7$ for lecturers). Significant deviances from this range should be “made up” in the following year through an increase or decrease in course assignments. Two- and three-year (and longer) averages shall be maintained and published to ensure that long-term biases do not occur. A spreadsheet that contains a complete list of faculty activity shall be maintained to facilitate these calculations and be made available to all faculty.

Surplus and deficit credits are cumulative. When a faculty member earns a full credit more than the expected load, then an assignment of one fewer course in the following year is justified. If a faculty member has a deficit of one full credit, then s/he will be expected to earn surplus credits the following year. This may be achieved through the scheduling of an extra course or other credit-bearing activities. All credit-bearing activities should be reported in each faculty member’s annual report (including artifacts from directed studies and internships).

These guidelines will be implemented beginning in the 2011-12 academic year and will **not** be applied retroactively.

Caveat

The purpose of this policy is to provide general guidelines for how much work is expected of faculty members. Despite the numerical nature of the credits and formulae, it is not the intention of the guidelines for faculty to nitpick about small differences in load across programs or across faculty within programs in the short term; some of the differences cannot be predicted in advance because the actual number of credits earned depends on student enrollment. Directors and faculty who find themselves doing this do so against the spirit of the guidelines. Instead, the Director and the faculty as a whole have the responsibility to ensure that over the long term, faculty are performing activities in an equitable way.