

College of Engineering
Faculty Workload Guidelines

May, 2002

Prepared by: Ad Hoc Committee,
Faculty Workload Guidelines

Roy Eckart, Chair
Frank Gerner
Narayanan Jayaraman
Tom Mantei

College of Engineering Workload Guidelines

Background

In August 2001, the dean requested each department to review their workload policy and forward it to him by October 30, 2001. These policies were to be reviewed and discussed among faculty, but not request a formal vote. In November, 2001, the dean appointed an ad-hoc committee headed by Roy Eckart to review these policies and to use these policies as the basis for a common set of workload guidelines for the College of Engineering. The committee consisted of Drs. Frank Gerner, Narayanan Jayaraman and Tom Mantei.

The committee started their work in December and began a series of weekly meetings from January, 2002 through March, 2002. All the department workload policies were reviewed. The ECECS workload policy was used as the template for the college guidelines, with substantial input from the other workload documents.

Draft versions of the workload guidelines were reviewed by all the department heads. The guidelines were modified based on comments received from the department heads and dean. The department heads were asked to discuss the revised draft with departmental faculty and forward their comments to the committee. All comments were discussed and considered. The current version of the workload guidelines incorporates many of the comments submitted by the faculty.

Objective of the Workload Guidelines

The objective of the workload guidelines is to recognize faculty who are contributing to the success of the college through a combination of teaching, research and service. The guidelines must also accommodate those faculty who have concentrated activities in one or more of these three areas. For example, strong researchers may have reduced service activities while faculty with high service loads may have less research activities. The basic objective of this policy is to define and identify approximately equal workloads for all faculty within a given department.

Basic Concept

The department head has the responsibility for, *management and oversight of course offerings and teaching assignments*, (ref: Agreement Between UC and the AAUP; Article 31.2.8). Consistent with this agreement, the fundamental teaching assignment is classroom instruction and the unit of measure is the "class." The number of "classes" that a faculty member teaches in a year constitutes a base workload. The workload guidelines strive to develop a methodology whereby research and service activities can be equated to classroom instruction. The point system and the weighting factors are an attempt to quantify the relationship between classroom instruction and research and service activities.

Consistent with the university workload guidelines, the base teaching load is defined as three, three-credit hour courses per quarter with consideration given to faculty active in research and service. Defining this workload as the equivalent of 100 points, non-monetary buyout of courses can be achieved through a combination of research and service. Research and service can reduce this teaching load to 40 points. Non-monetary buyout (research and service) can not be used to reduce the teaching load below 40 points. Monetary buyout at the rate of 8.33% for each three-credit hour, one quarter course, can reduce this load; but in no instance may a faculty member teach less than one graduate course and one undergraduate course per year.

The point system and weighting factors are established so that the typical faculty member could easily achieve the 60 points required to reduce his/her teaching load to four or five courses per year, depending on class enrollment.

The Workload Guidelines

Teaching Load (per year) Points

The teaching workload is based on lecture and laboratory classes. Courses such as readings, independent study and seminars are not included in the workload.

The teaching load for Associate/Assistant Department Heads, Graduate Study Directors and Undergraduate Program Directors will be 40 points. Reduced teaching loads of 40 points per year will also be given to untenured faculty for the initial three-year appointment.

Total points = $\frac{4}{3}$ (credit hours + $\frac{1}{5}$ enrollment) + one x (number of senior projects)
Consistent with college policy, enrollment credit is limited to 40 students per class.

Research Load (based on a three-year total) Points

Total points = sum of items below:

- 1) $\frac{1}{20}$ x research expenditures (in units of thousands of dollars)
- 2) 10 x number of PhD students (graduated)
- 3) 3 x number of MS thesis students (graduated)
- 4) 5 x number of archival journal papers and book chapters published
- 5) 2 x number of reviewed proceedings published
- 6) 10 x number of books published

Service Load (per year) Points

- 1) one x number of committees + one x number of committee chairs
- 2) 3 x number of professional journal editorships or co-editorships
- 3) graduate committee support: one-half x number of MS thesis defenses + one x number of PhD dissertation defenses
- 4) 5 points for sustained undergraduate advising, undergraduate program support and recruitment activities

Implementation of the Guidelines

The Workload Guidelines will be implemented and reviewed according to the following schedule.

1. For 2002/2003, department heads will accumulate workload data based on the Workload Guidelines, while following the guidelines as far as practical,
2. in March 2003, the “results” for all faculty will be reviewed within departments and shared with the dean,
3. in April, 2003, a new ad hoc committee will review the results and faculty comments and recommend modification to the COE faculty,
4. a revised workload document (Workload Guidelines – 2003) will be brought to the COE faculty by the last faculty meeting of the 2002/2003 academic year, with department heads charged to implement the guidelines as soon as practical,
5. the Workload Guidelines – 2003, will be the basis for workload until 2005, at which time a thorough review will be completed.

Example Calculations for the Guidelines

Appendix B contains an example of a workload guideline calculation.

Appendix A

Frequently Asked Questions (and Comments)

1. Why weren't the faculty involved in the preparation of the workload policy?

The faculty were involved from the start of the process. Departmental workload policies provided the initial foundation of the college guidelines. Faculty input was requested for the early draft versions of the policy. Faculty input was solicited as the guidelines were finalized.

2. Why isn't quality addressed in the workload policy?

The guidelines address the workload for the faculty. The quality of the faculty's work must be addressed in some other venue, such as the annual review or re-appointment, promotion and tenure reviews.

3. Can you increase the weighting factors for some of the scholarly activities; such as books, reviewed journal articles, etc.?

The working group increased the weighting factor for journal articles from two to five and books from six to ten.

4. There is a need to account for many more faculty activities: organizing companies, sitting on PhD committees, inventions, jets teams competition, consulting activities and many, many more.

One of the initial drafts did continue a lengthy list of such activities. Many faculty were critical of this approach calling it a "bean counting exercise." The committee decided to include only the most significant faculty activities and to lump together a small number of critical service activities (Service Load item 4.)

5. Shouldn't graduate courses have a higher weighting factor than undergraduate courses?

It is very important that our best faculty teach undergraduate courses. We do not want to bias undergraduate courses in favor of graduate courses. There is also considerable disagreement on whether or not graduate courses require more work than undergraduate courses.

6. Will these guidelines be used for other purposes such as reallocation of resources?

No. Any reallocation of resources would be evaluated by departmental performance analysis.

7. Should lab courses have a higher weighting factor?

The committee discussed this question. It appears that lab courses are taught in a number of different styles, some requiring more faculty time and some requiring less faculty time. The committee concluded that in general, lab courses required approximately the same effort as lecture courses.

8. Can you provide some practical examples of a “guidelines” calculation?

An example calculation is shown in Appendix B.

Appendix B
Example of Guideline Calculation

A faculty member has the following statistics.

Classroom Instruction (3 cr. hr. courses) (annual)

Autumn	1 course	20 students
Winter	1 course	25 students
	1 course	10 students
Spring	1 course	40 students

Senior Design Projects – two teams, three students per team

Three-year Research and Graduate Student Mentoring	
research expenditures	\$300,000
PhD students graduated	1
MS students graduated	4
papers published	2
reviewed conference proceedings	3

Service Activities (annual)

committees	3
committee chairs	1
MS thesis defense	3
PhD dissertation defense	2
advisor to undergraduate class	
active in undergraduate recruiting	

Research Load

$$RL = 1/20 (300) + 10 (1) + 3 (4) + 5 (2) + 2 (3)$$

$$RL = 53$$

Service Load

$$SL = 1 (4) + 1 (3) + 1 (2) + 5$$

$$SL = 12.5$$

Total RL plus SL = 65.5 points

The guidelines limit the credit for research and service load to 60 points. So, the teaching load would be reduced from 100 to 40 points.

Teaching Load (4 courses)

$$TL = (9) + (17) + (15) = 41 \text{ points}$$