

## Guidelines for Faculty Workload

### Background:

The workload committee (Nolen, Sanders, Jegatheesan, Hilton, Davis, Matheson) drafted a set of guidelines for faculty workload to inform individual faculty members, areas, and area chairs of College expectations and to promote an equitable distribution of work across the faculty. These guidelines are consistent with our COE Strategic Plan and Mission Statement, and workload deliberations within areas should be informed by those documents as well.

We have shared the draft guidelines in meetings of Faculty Council, COE Leadership Team, and Area Chairs, as well as in COE Faculty Meetings to solicit input and answer questions.

At its June 2, 2017 meeting, the Faculty Council voted to support the guidelines, 7 for, 1 abstain, 1 against. The guidelines were endorsed by the administration and presented to the faculty at the June faculty meeting, where it was noted that the document contains *guidelines* and can be changed as needed.

UPDATE (July 12, 2018): The setting of area SCH targets is a work in progress at this point, as a mechanism for determining those targets is still under development. In the 17-18 AY, area targets were based on the historical individual target for tenure line faculty of 420 SCH, with 85 SCH credited for any course release or buy-out. ~ S. B. Nolen

UPDATE (December 2021): The area SCH targets were revised in 2019 and the document has been revised to reflect these new targets. Faculty code has also changed where senior lecturer positions no longer exist and newly established teaching professor titles are active. The new document reflects all of these changes.

### Table of Contents

<i>COE Service Expectations for Faculty</i> .....	2
Assistant Teaching Professor.....	2
Assistant Professor .....	2
Associate Professor and Associate Teaching Professor.....	2
Full Professor and Teaching Professor .....	3
<i>COE Scholarship Expectations for Faculty</i> .....	4
<i>COE Teaching Expectations for Faculty</i> .....	5
Principles: Student Credit Hour production.....	5
Principles: Course assignment negotiation and distribution within areas.....	6
<i>Guide for Area Chairs in Annual Course Planning/Negotiation</i> .....	8

## ***COE Service Expectations for Faculty***

### **Assistant Teaching Professor**

As active members of the COE community, Assistant Teaching Professors are expected to participate in COE or UW governance as well as staying current on their professional scholarly field of expertise. In general, they should serve on/as:

- 1 COE governance committee 2 of every 3 years
- 1 UW committee, local community partnership/outreach project/presentation, *or* 1 professional/national committee (e.g., AERA) at least 1 of every 3 years

New Assistant Teaching Professors may have reduced service expectations in the first two years.

### **Assistant Professor**

Assistant Professors need to be active citizens of the COE, both internally and by representing the COE at the local, state, or national level. At the same time, they must balance service with the need to establish a research trajectory and teaching record; together these prepare the assistant professor for promotion. National and international service especially can provide visibility and networking opportunities to assistant professors, while contributing to the field. In general, **after their first year**, assistant professors should serve on/as:

- COE or UW governance committees 2 of every 3 years (but should not serve as chairs)
- Ad hoc reviewer for journals, books, and/or professional conferences (e.g., AERA)
- Attending and participating in professional, national conferences (at least 1 per year)

**By the end of their 4th year**, they are encouraged to engage in yearly national service. This could include

- Serve on a professional/national organization or SIG committee
- Provide journal manuscript reviews
- Serve as a reviewer of grant proposals

### **Associate Professor and Associate Teaching Professor**

With promotion comes added service responsibilities to the COE and UW. In addition, Associate Professors should be establishing a strong national presence in research and service especially as they prepare for promotion. Specifically, they should serve on/as:

- COE or UW governance committees most years, with additional service on UW committees, additional Ad-Hoc College committees, search committees, and taking on increasingly responsible leadership roles (e.g., ADs, chairs of college committee, program leads, etc.)
- Editorial board(s) for national/international journals or equivalent
- Local, state, regional and national task forces, advisory boards, etc.
- Provide expertise/pro bono service to local education or community groups

### **Full Professor and Teaching Professor**

Full professors and Teaching Professors should serve as leaders with the COE and UW, as well as on national and international stages. The expectations are that Full professors and Teaching Professors should serve on/as:

- Mentoring junior faculty (formally and informally)
- COE or UW committees most years, with additional service on UW committees, especially in leadership capacities (e.g., Faculty president/VP, ADs, chairs, chairs of college committees, program leads, Faculty Senate, University councils, etc.)
- Editor or editorial board member for national/international journals or equivalent
- Local, state, regional and national task forces, advisory boards, etc.
- Provide expertise/pro bono service to local, state, regional education or community groups
- Contribute to COE visibility and impact through local and national media

## ***COE Scholarship Expectations for Faculty***

### **Assumptions:**

1. Scholarship norms are informed by the COE strategic plan and consistent with its goals of producing new knowledge, developing and supporting partnerships to transform educational systems, and recruiting and supporting a diverse student body to become leaders in the transformation of inequitable educational systems.
2. It is understood that scholarship expectations vary by discipline within the College of Education.
3. Within and across disciplines, differences in research methods (e.g., experiments, surveys, design-based research, ethnography) are expected to lead to varying number of publications.
4. Mentors (area chairs, mentoring committees) need to provide accurate feedback to individual faculty on their scholarly productivity, and so should be familiar with relevant national norms for their fields.
5. Expectations for assistant professors should result in sufficient scholarly productivity to merit tenure and promotion on schedule. These expectations should be close enough to national norms to provide a solid case for outside referees.

### Consider:

- a. Numbers (for example, if the primary mode of publication is research articles, on average 2 per year)
- b. Quality
- c. Type of publication (e.g., data-based vs practitioner-oriented, policy report, book)
- d. Venue (top-tier preferred)
- e. Authorship (demonstration of leadership role - e.g., first authorships)
- f. Grants (should have applied for one or more, usually in collaboration with other faculty, before going up for promotion, being awarded a grant(s) would be desirable but not expected before promotion)
6. Expectations for tenured professors should include the above categories, with the following additional considerations:
  - a. Steady productivity over time, although may be more uneven due to new large projects, other shifting responsibilities, etc.
  - b. Grant productivity (PI or co-PI) - this will vary by discipline due to availability
  - c. Authorships - should include students as authors and/or practitioners as authors
  - d. Impact on the field
  - e. Local impact (e.g., through partnerships, work at the state level, etc.)
  - f. Provision of research mentorships for students and post-docs
7. Research faculty should use the guidelines above appropriate to their rank.

## ***COE Teaching Expectations for Faculty***

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, providing classroom instruction, planning, program development, program oversight, and advising. Members of the faculty are expected to strive to deliver the highest quality programs and instruction to the students of the University. While many of these duties cannot be quantified, the College does have requirements for providing classroom instruction (i.e., teaching load).

Teaching load will be negotiated within College of Education (COE) areas. Chairs are in the best position to organize negotiation of load based on their familiarity with programs and faculty housed within them. Specific procedures for negotiation are likely to vary by area, but a set of possible procedures is provided at the end of this document. Finally, chairs will work with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to ensure a balance of faculty preference, coverage of required courses, and instruction budgets are all met.

Each area will be responsible for producing a target number of Student Credit Hours (SCH) as described below. Chairs will be responsible for leadership in considering (a) fair distribution of workload, and (b) ways to increase or make more efficient SCH production through modifications to programs, pedagogy, admissions, etc.

### **Principles: Student Credit Hour production**

1. Area Targets. Each area will have a target number of SCH (400 SCH \* # tenure line faculty) it is responsible for generating in order to contribute to funding COE operations. This target will be determined by the Dean, based on (1) the number of tenure-line teaching faculty and teaching professors within the area (i.e., for the purpose of SCH calculation, only those who primarily teach courses), and (2) the budgetary needs of the COE.
2. Target SCH for each area will be determined by adding together (a) and (b) as:
  - a. The standard SCH multiplier for tenure-track teaching faculty x number of tenure- line faculty in area, and
  - b. The standard SCH multiplier for teaching professors x number of teaching professors in area.

For *example*, suppose Area A has 10 tenure-line teaching faculty and 3 teaching professors who all teach a full load. *If* the standard tenure-line multiplier is 400 SCH and the teaching professor multiplier is 2000, the target for Area A is:

$$10 (400) + 3 (2000) = 10,000.$$

Area chairs would then lead negotiations to distribute these 10,000 credit hours equitably across individuals within the area, taking into account the factors below that also influence the work involved in teaching a course.

3. Standard SCH multipliers will be determined by the Dean, in consultation with faculty (via Faculty Council and the Budget Committee). There will be separate multipliers for tenure-line teaching faculty and for teaching-line professors. Standard SCH multipliers will be reviewed annually and adjusted as needed.
4. Course buy-outs and course releases will be credited at 25% of the SCH multiplier (e.g., 100 SCH for tenure-line faculty or 500 SCH for teaching-line faculty) for each course.

**Principles: Course assignment negotiation and distribution within areas**

5. Basic assumptions.
  - a. To control instructional costs, all core courses will be taught by core faculty (i.e., tenure-line faculty and teaching professors). A core course is defined as a required course that must be offered on a regular basis (e.g., most undergraduate courses, TEP courses, graduate courses required by one or more programs). Course releases for core courses cannot increase instructional costs (i.e., must be covered by external funding if a part time instructor is required). Exceptions to this assumption will be considered during evaluation of the overall instructional budget.
  - b. A full teaching load for teaching professors is 7-9 courses. Teaching professor instructional responsibilities are negotiated by contract with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.
  - c. Teaching load for individual faculty must be in compliance with the UW [Instructional Responsibility Policy](https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/working/responsibilities/instructional-responsibility-policy/) (<https://ap.washington.edu/ahr/working/responsibilities/instructional-responsibility-policy/>).
6. Teaching loads will be negotiated as *part of* a fair distribution of workload. Although the SCH multiplier provides a starting point for negotiating individual faculty member loads, areas should also take into account the following that might affect individual SCH production and course assignment:
  - a. Teaching Professors may be hired to *teach specific sets of courses*.
  - b. Teaching in programs with cohort enrollment (e.g., teacher education, certain self-sustaining programs).
  - c. Pedagogical differences (e.g., clinical supervision, studio courses; online vs face to face instruction, writing courses).
  - d. Level of course (graduate vs undergraduate)
  - e. Solo vs team teaching (in general, SCH should be split between instructors)
  - f. Level of teaching support (e.g., large course with no TA)
  - g. New course vs. existing course
  - h. Class size
  - i. Advising loads

- j. Program development needs
- k. Course releases (administrative, negotiated as part of hire, buy-outs, etc.).
- l. Other considerations as determined within area

## **Guide for Area Chairs in Annual Course Planning/Negotiation**

To: Area Chairs

From Sue Nolen for the Workload Committee April 30th 2017

Here are some notes on implementing the teaching load policy generated in response to feedback from various sources:

The teaching workload document is intended to provide a guideline for transparent, equitable teaching load negotiations, as well as shared expectations for teaching that take into account position type and any specific, contracted expectations.

By changing the unit of analysis to the Area (instead of the individual) SCH production will become a *group goal* and will be negotiated openly and collaboratively, rather than in individual negotiations with chairs. This should lead to greater equity and transparency within Areas, as well as reducing the number of individual negotiations needed.

The expectations themselves can become the subject of discussion and modification as needed to ensure equity across Areas.

Here is a possible strategy for an annual course planning/negotiation process:

1. Areas identify courses regularly taught by area faculty in the following categories
  - a. Program Core: Courses required by programs in the Area and taught regularly (e.g., quarterly, annually, bi-annually).
  - b. College Core: Courses required by (and taught by) programs in multiple areas (e.g., Inquiry sequence, Qual methods)
  - c. Professional Prep Core: Required courses for professional prep programs (e.g., School Psych, TEP)
  - d. Undergraduate Core: Undergraduate courses taught on a regular basis (currently this is almost all UG courses)
  - e. Other program courses: Elective or specialization courses within programs that are offered on a regular basis (could include seminar course numbers to be placeholders)
  
2. SCH targets for each Area are set by the Dean (in consultation with fiscal staff and Budget & Planning Committee). The method for setting targets should take into account such data as prior years' SCH production by faculty type, number of faculty of each type, specific contracted expectations (e.g., administration, SL teaching loads), structural limitations on enrollment in certain programs, state vs self-sustaining budget, and other constraints). In addition, since our instructional budget provides funds to "fill the gap" in other budgetary areas such as individual programs (i.e., TEP, Grad programs, research, professional development funds, etc.), the SCH targets will also consider the strategic plan and initiative decisions by the Dean.
  
3. Areas meet to plan together how to staff courses based on teaching expertise, fair

rotations for types of courses, faculty leaves and buyouts. (Note: Course tagging in the courses database will facilitate this.) Some programs are already doing this and have found it facilitates multi-year planning and reduces annual negotiations.

4. Institutional Research (IR) generates a summary of the predicted SCH that would likely be generated by the negotiated plan for each Area. A list of any core courses not taught by salaried faculty (to include regular doctoral student instructors) can also be generated.
5. Predicted SCH can then be compared to Area targets for SCH. If predicted SCH is significantly lower than the target, the teaching plan can be adjusted to better meet expectations.
6. Core courses not covered by salaried faculty or doc students need to be the subject of further deliberations. These could lead to strategies such as changing the frequency of offering the course, reducing the number of courses tagged as “core,” recruiting other salaried faculty to teach those courses, or deciding that the pedagogical need for the core course to be staffed by an adjunct (e.g, a district specialist) merits an exception (this may require additional SCH to be generated by the program to cover instructional costs).