

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

3-30-2019

Faculty Workload Policy

Dustin Anderson
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Dustin, "Faculty Workload Policy" (2019). *Faculty Senate Index*. 692.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/692>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Senate Executive Committee Motion Request

Approved by the Faculty Senate:

Not Approved by the Faculty Senate: 4/3/2019 (11 for, 22 against)

Approved by the President:

Not Approved by the President:

Approved by the President's Cabinet

Faculty Workload Policy

Submitted by: Dustin Anderson

3/20/2019

Motion(s):

Motion to approve the Faculty Workload policy for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook (section 322.07).

Rationale:

In the Fall of 2018, the Provost's office created an Ad Hoc committee to develop a Faculty Workload Policy. The committee, composed of faculty from each teaching college, was charged with drafting a detailed policy that would make clear the expectations for the standard university workload related to teaching, scholarship, and service. The underlying intention of this policy and procedure is to protect faculty by codifying expectations while allowing for multiple avenues to advance during their careers. The policy, developed by this committee, is specifically designed to enable colleges, schools, departments, and individual faculty to pursue, plan for, and recognize the fact that specific individuals and units will have unique objectives and will make different commitments among the three faculty roles. The policy distributes the primary responsibilities among faculty in a way that most equitably and efficiently advances this tripartite mission among quality teaching, excellent scholarship (including research and creative activity), and meaningful service to the institution, profession, and community. This policy contains a purpose, policy detail, procedure, and illustrative examples in effort to move away from one-size-fits-all practices, tacit agreements, or "understandings" about the roles and expectations of workload.

Response:

4/3/2019 Minutes

Motion – Faculty Workload Policy – Diana Cone (VPAA), Faculty Workload AdHoc Committee, Chair (page 3)

Brian Koehler (COSM and co-chair of this subcommittee) and Dustin Anderson (CAH) presented the proposed workload policy. This policy is an adjustment and replacement to the current policy. Anderson briefly explained the history of the GSU policy was made in 1998, which required all full-time faculty to teach 12 credit semester hours. In 2004, the load was 12 credit hours with adjustments made by chair and dean approval. In 2017, the current policy was put into place by the Consolidation Implementation committee. The standard load under this policy is “12 hours for tenure-line faculty and 15 for non-tenure track faculty.” The new work load policy would move away from this. The intent is to be less restrictive. Most faculty currently teach a 3/3 load with significant research. This is the typical tenure-track load. The proposed policy will add for some flexibility but sets generic guidelines. Accreditation agencies or other needs may require such flexibility. This policy provides guidelines to protect faculty. The subcommittee created examples of some typical workload models. These models are samples only; they are not meant to be exact. Workload may vary for individual faculty and departments, but we need some codification of expectations for annual evaluations.

Question: Rob Pirro (CBSS) expressed concern about the vetting of this proposal. He was concerned that this policy did not go through the Faculty Welfare committee. Further, the annual workload models give illustrative examples but imply consent between faculty and chair, but elsewhere it says load may vary depending on need. Did the committee discuss this ambiguity?

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded that the evaluative process must allow faculty to advance, and cannot present untenable situations. He offered the example of faculty covering for colleagues on FMLA; if their load increases, then they must be evaluated on the actual situation based on expectations put in writing, rather than the standard expectations for that department. Department level policies must allow faculty to advance. A change in standard load must be reflected in annual evaluations. As to the concern about faculty welfare involvement, Anderson responded that there were two items that did not go through Faculty Welfare, this item and the ratings of instruction placeholder. This assigned to an ad hoc in light of the load that Faculty Welfare already had with updates and corrections to the faculty handbook, and the Transitional Tenure and Promotion policy that was finished in March. The chair of the Faculty Welfare was able to review and provide feedback on the proposal. The assignment of the ad hoc was not to exclude the Welfare committee, but to be able to propose this policy during this year as it could have an impact teaching for the following year. Not putting it forward this year means another cycle on the standing policy.

Question: Michele Haberland (CAH) stated that she is on the faculty welfare committee. She stated that she did not see this policy nor did other members except for the committee chair. She expressed concern that this policy was not vetted by what she saw as normal channels. She was also concerned that the committee was appointed and not elected.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) said that the subcommittee work was performed in light of successfully completing the university mission of having a workload in place by next academic year. Anderson asked if the concern was that the policy did not come from a faculty committee or that it did not come from the Welfare committee specifically. Haberland said both. Anderson said that the idea that faculty were on the committee was a misconception. The ad hoc was a faculty committee composed of faculty with members across colleges and rank. The policy wasn't just vetted by faculty, it was created by faculty. Haberland asked if the committee members who appointed since members of the Welfare committee were elected. Anderson responded that while the committee was appointed, some of those members had been elected as college representatives in other capacities. Anderson indicated that the members of the committee were listed at the end of the proposal.

Question: Christy Moore (WCHP) stated that she has two issues with the proposed policy: 1) it does not address non-administrative twelve-month faculty members, especially regarding summer hours, and 2) nowhere are zero credit hours such as labs accounted for.

Response: Catherine Gilbert (WCHP), responded that the committee had two principles to stay within: 1) the university system doesn't recognize summer teaching, and 2) the goal to create a flexible workload policy that allowed for variation. The proposed policy allows for departments to make these workload decisions. Faculty and chairs determine the specifics. Dustin Anderson (CAH) added that this proposed policy requires that departments having clear guidelines. Christy Moore (WCHP) followed by asking what would happen if a department head won't work with a faculty member. She remarked that in such situations, people end up overworked and ready to quit. Anderson responded that the Faculty Grievance committee and other avenues would protect against such situations.

Question: Marshal Ransom (COSM) commented that a number of things related to workload are negotiated between faculty member and chair. He pointed out these statements in the proposed policy: "may vary for individual faculty as agreed by faculty member and chair and approved by dean," "chair in consultation with faculty member will recommend workload" and later "the dean will accept or modify the load." It does not say that the Provost will make this decision.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) confirmed that workload decisions go up to management at the dean level and are then collected by the Provost's office. Carl Reiber (Provost) confirmed that the diversity of activities is not something the Provost should micromanage. Chairs along with faculty and deans make these decisions. The Provost only intervenes if there is an issue.

Question: Jack Simmons (CAH) is concerned by this phrase: “decision made annually during merit review process” implying faculty can change workload. He expressed concern that this might make long-term research projects and promotion difficult. Annual workload models ask us to give percentages. How could this work out? How do we measure workload? The proposed policy recommends that we look at prior history of faculty. How will this work when workloads were historically different? Once on a workload, how could one alter it?

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded that the proposal states each department must put in writing specifics and timelines. Departments must establish timeline for moving from one load to another. He stated that the committee could clarify conversion of time and effort and how that might be tracked. He agrees that if a faculty member has been on a set load and wants to change, that conversation should come into play in annual review. The spirit of this policy is intended to protect faculty and to document why loads are as they are for faculty.

Question: Heidi Altman (COBS) asked about the proposed 5/5 teaching load. In the faculty handbook, those promoted through lecturer levels must demonstrate teaching and service or professional growth and development. How can a lecturer find time for this on a 5/5 load?

Response: Brian Koehler (COSM) explained that the committee working on the policy found a lot of variation in what lecturers are doing. The committee tried to show a range in the load of lecturers and all tenure-line faculty in order to support the path to promotion. Dustin Anderson (CAH) reiterated that the effort is to protect faculty. If a lecturer is moved to 5/5, that lecturer would be evaluated with this load in mind.

Question: Heidi Altman (COBS) then pointed out that faculty development is necessary for promotion. Do we separate lecturer from contingent faculty? Those on a 5/5 load cannot go up for promotion according to this policy.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded that such issues should be fleshed out at the departmental level.

Question: Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) noted that in her college, some of the items listed here didn't seem realistic. She suggested that the policy should include some of the “invisible” service that takes up a lot of time. She suggested that we set realistic expectations and that 65% teaching, 10 % scholarship, and 25 % service might be more realistic considering the direction of the university. Do we really think we will have three times as many hours for scholarship as service? And also, will we soon spend half as many hours on research as teaching? Realistically, this hasn't happened.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that the proposed policy contains illustrative examples only and not binding numbers. Percentages can vary at the department or individual level. This policy will push those departments without clear guidelines to develop them, and it will also protect faculty by articulating those expectations.

Vote: This motion was then moved to a vote. This motion did not pass. It will go back to the committee for revisions and then will be passed on to Faculty Welfare to review. Faculty Welfare will present the revised policy in May, and it will go back up for a vote. Meanwhile, the standing GSU workload policy stays in place.

3/26/2019: Approved to move to the floor.

Georgia Southern University Faculty Workload Policy

Purpose:

Georgia Southern University is a public comprehensive and Carnegie Doctoral/Research university with a tripartite responsibility: to provide transformative learning opportunities to students, support collaborative efforts to discover and disseminate knowledge, and to serve and strengthen society. The goal of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Workload policy is to distribute these responsibilities among faculty in a way that most equitably and efficiently advances this tripartite mission among teaching, scholarship (including research and creative activity), and service. The policy is designed to promote quality teaching, support excellent research and creative activity, and encourage meaningful service to the institution, profession, and community. It is also designed to enable colleges, schools, departments, and individual faculty to pursue, plan for, and recognize the fact that specific individuals and units will have unique objectives and will make different commitments among the three faculty roles.

Policy:

The superseding guidelines for this policy are the faculty workload expectations established by the University System of Georgia [LINK]. In meeting the system expectations, it is recognized that Georgia Southern University faculty members are expected to be productive in the areas of teaching, service, and (for tenure-track faculty) scholarship. The distribution of effort among these areas of responsibility may vary among faculty members and from year to year through the course of their careers.

Teaching

Teaching is the primary function of university faculty. Preparing lectures, instructing students, revising curricula, responding to students, holding office hours, evaluating assignments - these activities are all part of normal instructional duties. Additionally, the design, implementation, and analysis of programmatic assessment for our accrediting agencies are also a responsibility of instruction. Tenure-track faculty, particularly those seeking tenure and promotion, are generally expected to focus 60% of their workload toward teaching.

Scholarship

Tenure-track faculty are expected to actively pursue research or creative activity to improve their instruction and extend their disciplinary knowledge. Tenure-track faculty, particularly those seeking tenure and promotion, are generally expected to focus a minimum of 30% of their workload toward scholarly pursuits; however, continued scholarly workload assignment will depend on sustained scholarly production and outcomes.

Service

Service activities are vital to the mission and function of the University. As such all permanent faculty, both tenure and non-tenure track, are expected to assume an adequate share of departmental committee work and/or service to the institution, profession, and community, including institutional governance when selected. Attendance of departmental, college, and university meetings is expected of all faculty regardless of workload. It is generally expected for tenure-track faculty to focus a minimum 10% of their workload toward service work, but not more than 30%.

This policy provides a common reference for describing the varied work faculty members do as well as an agreed framework for discussions of that work. It also contains illustrative examples that may be used to develop an individual faculty member's workload assignment for the following year during each annual merit review process. The policy establishes some core standards, for instance that each 10% teaching workload is nominally equivalent to a semester-long, three-credit course or equivalent, and that all tenure-track faculty must allocate at least 10% of their time toward service to their discipline.

This policy also requires that each college and/or department establish, in writing, more specific explanations outlining the expectations and timelines for faculty effort in each of these areas. It requires Department Chairs to establish expectations as to the outcomes expected for a particular level of scholarship or service workload assignment. It is also requires departments to establish class norms (equating to the 10% teaching effort) appropriate to the discipline for the various courses taught; and equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research or clinical/practicum activities). Likewise, disciplines with writing-intensive courses, laboratory courses, studio and field experiences, etc., or with unusually heavy supervising and mentoring responsibilities, shall establish teaching load equivalencies through the shared governance process on the basis of this model.

These considerations must be formally discussed and incorporated into the faculty annual assessment process.

Illustrative Examples of Annual Workload Models

Some examples of possible workload assignment combinations appear below. The examples reflect various percentages of effort in the three faculty performance areas. The model does not dictate, or favor, any particular mix of these activities although the majority of tenure-track faculty will be on the standard workload indicated the Teaching-Scholarship Balanced Workload model. The examples given are merely illustrative and may vary for individual faculty, as agreed by the faculty member and Chair and as approved by the Dean.*

Teaching-Scholarship Balance Workload	
3-3 course load Teaching.....	60
S/CA.....	30
Service.....	10
Total	100

Administration Emphasis Workload	
Service.....	80
1-0 course load Teaching.....	10
S/CA.....	10
Total	100

Teaching Emphasis	
4-4 course load Teaching.....	80
S/CA.....	10
Service.....	10
Total	100

Non-tenure track - Service Emphasis	
4-4 course load Teaching.....	80
S/CA.....	0
Service.....	20
Total	100

Teaching - Service Emphasis	
3-3 course load Teaching.....	60
S/CA.....	10
Service.....	30
Total	100

Non-tenure track - Teaching Emphasis	
5-5 course load Teaching.....	100
S/CA.....	0
Service.....	0
Total	100

Scholarship Emphasis	
2-2 course load Teaching.....	40
S/CA.....	50
Service.....	10
Total	100

**Actual workload assignments for each faculty member will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual merit review.*

Procedure:

During the annual merit review process Department Chairs, in consultation with the faculty, will recommend a workload for each faculty member that divides effort between teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation will be based upon the faculty classification (tenure track, lecturer, etc.) as well as the service, scholarly, and creative activities of the faculty member. It must also support that

faculty member in meeting tenure and/or promotion expectations of the unit, to ensure fair evaluation at the point of P&T.

It is noted that specific assignments may vary depending on departmental and college needs and resources, and may also take into account a faculty member's prior history of success in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. As such Department Chairs should clearly articulate during the annual review process the outcomes expected to receive a particular workload division of effort. The Dean will either accept or modify the teaching load.

Appendix:

References: Language used in portions of this policy were developed using materials from Boise State University (Faculty Workload Policy) and Kennesaw State University (Faculty Handbook).

Ad hoc Committee Members:

Diana Cone, Chair
Dustin Anderson
Alicia Brunson
Sungkon Chang
Nedra Cossa
Daniel Cox
April Garrity
Catherine Gilbert
Brian Koehler
Dan Pioske
Rand Ressler
April Schueths
Stacy Smallwood
John Stone