



September 3, 2014

Dear Chairs and Directors:

Last year we discontinued collecting the faculty workload forms from departments. Although this might have reduced Chair's work slightly, it caused two problems: the College has no faculty workload data to report to the Provost, and departments may not have the documentation necessary to support annual reviews if audited by the Provost's Office. Let me explain further.

Carol Parker, Senior Associate Provost, has provided the following logic: all faculty must receive a written annual review; the review must be based on how well the faculty member met department workload standards for teaching, research, and service; workload data must form (at least in part) the objective basis for this assessment. It is my understanding that the Provost's Office will be conducting an audit of selected departments to ensure that this process was followed when conducting annual reviews.

At the same time, we in the College Office had hoped the ROM data sheets would allow us to report the proportion of faculty were meeting the Faculty Handbook minimum and normal standards for both teaching and academic workload as set out in policies C100 and C110. (See below.)

C100: Academic Load

"The 'typical' academic load as defined herein and referenced in policy C110 will be 23 load units, which is the sum of 9 teaching load units, 9 scholarly work load units, and 5 service load units."

C110: Teaching Assignments

"5.1 A full-time faculty member normally shall be assigned a minimum teaching load of nine load units each semester."

Unfortunately the ROM worksheets in their current form do not provide us any way of knowing if a particular faculty member meets the 23 load unit standard, and as a result we cannot report to the Provost, as required, the fraction of our faculty who fall below that standard.

The “logic” behind reporting faculty workload using a common format is to provide consistency of reporting across the College, not to constrain each department to a common workload. It is quite acceptable for each department to establish workload standards and norms with a variance that reflects differences across disciplines. However, in order to report workloads, each department must establish these standards and norms. Using them, the chair, through whatever review process the department has established, can conduct annual reviews, determine merit salary increases and make the appropriate salary adjustments.

Consequently I am asking all departments to provide workload information in a new form (fortunately based on the previous form) which, when combined with the ROM worksheets, will allow us to both monitor and report College-wide faculty workloads to the Provost. This form will also provide Chairs with a single document containing the data underlying, in part, faculty annual reviews, as well as provide supporting documentation if, and when, audited by the Provost.

Attached you will find a template Faculty Workload form. All faculty with department appointments should be included, with a note if the appointment is less than 1.0FTE. SVP Parker often refers to department standards when discussing workloads, and so each department should establish a standard for each category of workload. It is reasonable for standards to differ across departments, but they should be measured in the units indicated by the Handbook, and they should be applied consistently to all faculty in the department. There are some norms, however, which apply across the College. A regular, 3-credit hour class would be assigned 3 teaching load units, and larger sections may be assigned more units. While the balance of workload units may not be in the ratio 40:40:20, the limits set in the handbook should be followed. (For example, you should not assign more than 18 units to research or 10 units to service.)



Philip Ganderton
Senior Associate Dean