

UNIVERSITY of NORTHERN COLORADO

Recommendations for Implementing Differentiated Workload for Faculty

by the Research Advisory Council
with Input from Deans, AVPs, the Provost, Faculty, Chairs, and Directors

March 27, 2013

Purpose. At the University of Northern Colorado (UNC), a *teacher-scholar model* characterizes the multifaceted work of faculty members, whereby insights from research, scholarship, and creative works (RSCW) are integrated into instruction and inspire students to process disciplinary information deeply, critically, and creatively. Conversely, faculty members at UNC continuously improve their teaching with RSCW, integrating the latest disciplinary insights into their instruction. Increasingly, community involvement enlivens dynamic interchanges between teaching and scholarship, with service to UNC specifically and to society generally invigorating faculty scholarship and providing an impetus for student engagement. Thus, a faculty member's efforts in RSCW; instruction, advisement, and mentorship; and service to the University, community, profession, and society are closely intertwined.

These interconnections notwithstanding, it is important to determine whether a faculty member's separate assignments in RSCW, instruction, and service are effectively aligned with his or her professional aspirations and the needs of the academic unit and University at large. The invaluable diversity that exists among faculty members at UNC, who enter the academy with different backgrounds and at any given time work in distinct stages of their careers, often results in individuals wishing to invest more effort in one or more areas than is typical of customary loads.

At the University of Northern Colorado (UNC), *differentiated workload* is considered a mechanism for supporting faculty scholarship (Board Policy [BP] 2-3-404). More broadly, it provides a way to align the unique talents of individual faculty members with the needs of the program and institution.

In the Research Plan 2012-2015, we in the Research Advisory Council (RAC), with input from colleagues across campus, identified differentiated workload as a strategy for increasing time for scholarly endeavors of faculty members who are especially motivated and productive in research, scholarship, and creative works (RSCW; see Goal 1 in http://www.unco.edu/research/pdfs/UNCResearchPlan_2012-15.pdf). We also see it as a tool for supporting faculty members with exceptional talents in teaching and service, and for academic programs and colleges to intensify their efforts in certain areas.

To determine how differentiated workload policies might support RSCW in particular, we talked with colleagues and campus leaders and reviewed Board Policy, University Regulations (UR), and policies at other institutions. With these guidelines and perspectives in mind, and with the broader concerns of helping faculty and academic units more generally, we offer recommendations for implementing differentiated workload at UNC. The purpose of this document is to summarize these recommendations.

Current Conditions. From discussions with faculty members, deans, chairs, and directors, we have learned that differentiated workload is not commonly implemented at UNC, and for several reasons: concerns

about equity for faculty in different assignments; a preference that all faculty in a unit be productive in RSCW (e.g., so as to meet accreditation standards); challenges in making distinctions among individual faculty members' performance outcomes; difficulties in replacing a faculty member in teaching a course; uncertainties about the institutional perspective on differentiated workload; and an absence of precedents in defining performance expectations for non-standard workloads.

These are important concerns. Yet UNC has numerous faculty with exceptionally strong abilities and interests who would benefit from the opportunity to invest more time in focused areas – RSCW, instruction, or service – than is possible with standard assignments. Moreover, departments, schools, colleges, University Libraries, and the University at large may be able to promote institutional achievements in core areas more systematically to the extent that faculty can be strategically deployed in addressing mission-relevant initiatives.

Relevant policies, implementation recommendations, a coda of comments, and a brief planning document are included in the remainder of this document. Readers are encouraged to review relevant guidelines in BP and UR manuals in their entirety.

General Guidelines for Workload. According to the Board Policy Manual, each college (and University Libraries) defines workload components of instruction, scholarship, and service as appropriate to the disciplines and professions they represent. BP specifies that workload assignments are to:

- (a) maintain high quality, and academically sound programs.*
- (b) facilitate the accomplishment of program area, department, school, college, and University goals in teaching, scholarship and service.*
- (c) facilitate the professional development of faculty.*
- (d) maintain student credit hour production and numbers of majors and other students served.*
- (e) link workload to evaluation for promotion, tenure, and compensation discussions.*
- (f) adhere to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education standards for contact time per credit hour. BP 2-3-401(1)*

BP further specifies that the common workload for fulltime faculty is comprised of 30 workload units per academic year:

A full-time faculty workload (1.0 Full-Time Equivalent -- FTE) consists of 30 workload units per academic year. Department chairs/school directors are responsible for assigning workloads. BP 2-3-401(3)

- ❖ **Implementation Recommendation 1.** To clarify the nature of standard assignments and acceptable deviations from these assignments, each college specifies typical workload divisions or the ranges in allocation for the 30 annual workload units in instruction, scholarship, and service for full-time faculty. These standard assignments may need to vary among academic programs, with chairs, directors, and faculty members contributing to development of one model, or a family of models, of workload within the college.

The following table with parameters for workload, organized by faculty classification, is adapted from a workload policy for full-time faculty in the College of Natural and Health Sciences, http://www.unco.edu/nhs/pdf/workload_policy.pdf and http://www.unco.edu/nhs/pdf/workload_policy_preamble.pdf. The workload assumes 30 workload units per academic year, in alignment with BP.

	Tenured Faculty		Tenure-Track Faculty		Contract-Renewable Faculty	
	Workload Unit Range	Percent Effort Range	Workload Unit Range	Percent Effort Range	Workload Unit Range	Percent Effort Range
Teaching	12-24	40-80%	12-21	40-70%	18-30	60-100%
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Works	3-15	10-50%	6-15	20-50%	0-12	0-40%
Service	3-12	10-40%	3-9	10-30%	0-12	0-40%
Total	30 units	100%	30 units	100%	30 units	100%

As another example, University Libraries indicates that the standard workload distribution for its faculty is 60% librarianship, 20% scholarship, and 20% service.

The implications of these models may not be relevant to all colleges or units therein. Nevertheless, the principle of establishing a standard workload (or range) would be a worthwhile goal so as to ensure equity, effective deployment of personnel, and transparency of prospects for differentiated workload.

It is our hope that discussions among faculty, chairs and directors, and deans and associate deans begin by *Fall Semester of 2013* and culminate in models by *May 2014*.

Factors in Workload Assignments. According to BP, workload is defined as *the distribution of faculty effort across the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service, including special assignments when applicable. BP-3-401(2)(a)*

- (I) *Instruction. Includes all activities associated with teaching activities¹ related to credit hour production, i.e., maintenance of currency in content and pedagogy, tutoring, supervising student research, directing theses/dissertations, directing of performances and/or productions.²*
- (II) *Scholarship. Scholarship encompasses both research and its dissemination, and other creative or artistic activity relevant to the discipline of the individual professor. It may create new knowledge (discovery), synthesize existing information (integration), and devise ways to use knowledge (application), or lead to the production of artistic works and performances. This includes activities that advance the faculty member's professional and disciplinary competence, advance knowledge in the discipline, and result in work that is invited or subjected to peer review.*
- (III) *Service. Includes professional activities such as service on program area, department, school, college, and University committees; serving on faculty governance bodies; program administration; advising students on their academic progress or professional development; sponsoring student organizations; participating in professional organizations in one's discipline; and contributing one's expertise and time to civic activities in the larger community.³ BP 2-3-401(2) (b) (1-3)*

On the basis of "college equating practices," variations on standard workload are permitted under BP:

¹ Librarianship in the case of University Libraries faculty.

² Course load, which obviously drives credit hours, is a central determinant of a faculty member's instructional load. Other factors, including supervision of student research and performances, are not necessarily entered into current calculations, a concern that needs to be addressed.

³ UNC faculty are also active contributors to the peer-review process, evaluating books and manuscripts and judging performances, serving as consultant reviewers of dossiers by colleagues at other institutions seeking tenure and promotion, etc.

4 DWL IN FACULTY

The following are among additional factors that influence faculty effort and might be considered in the development of college equating practices: student credit hours generated; number of contact hours; class size; class level; honors designation; number of instructors (team teaching); number of course preparations; previous experience in teaching a course; development of a new course; off-site instruction; use of distance learning technologies; inclusion of new pedagogical or technological strategies for classroom instruction; direction of performance ensembles; supervision and/or coordination of practica, internships, field experiences, participation in partnership schools and directed studies; supervision of student research, both undergraduate and graduate levels; supervision of undergraduate theses, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations; advising load and level; scholarly productivity; and responsibilities for program administration. BP 2-3-401(2)

- ❖ **Implementation Recommendation 2.** Colleges, in consultation with their departments and schools, formalize the particular factors or combinations of factors that determine workload for full-time faculty in their units. These factors are complex, but those considered to be of consequence in workload assignments should be clearly articulated. Deans, chairs and directors, and faculty members may find it helpful to prioritize certain factors initially and then develop a more comprehensive system over time.

The particular models that work for one college will not necessarily work for another. As one example, the Monfort College of Business communicates an expectation that tenured and tenure-track faculty members teach a 12-hour instructional load unless they are active in research, scholarship, and creative works. Faculty members in MCB are assigned a 9-hour instructional load when they are professionally active. The expectation is communicated as follows:

Published faculty need NOT apply for reassigned time for scholarship. Chairs may automatically place a faculty member on a 9-hour teaching load if he/she has accomplished one of the following:

- *Has published at least one article (in the area of his/her teaching discipline) in an appointed journal during the past two years (four semesters)*
- *Has published at least an article in the area of his/her teaching discipline in a top 20 journal during the past three years (six semesters)*
- *Has published a book or book supplement (that carries the name of the author) that relates to his/her teaching discipline during the past two years.*
- *Has published a case with instructor's notes during the past two years.*

In the Monfort of College of Business scheme, instructional load is determined largely by documentation of an active program in research in particular outlets, which is compatible with their accreditation requirements. In another context, it might make sense to focus on a different array of factors, perhaps level of instruction (undergraduate and graduate), credit for individualized mentorship, etc.

In addressing this recommendation, colleges may wish to re-assert their adherence to an existing scheme, revise their model, or if none is available, develop a new model that formalizes desired practices, in consultation with chairs, directors, and faculty members. Given the complexity of faculty workload, a fully comprehensive scheme that accurately represents all factors may not be quickly achieved or even ultimately possible. Nevertheless, transparency on major factors considered in work assignments is a worthwhile goal and a foundation for differentiated workload. We recommend that discussions begin by *Fall Semester 2013* and culminate in models of primary factors affecting workload by *May 2014*.

Procedures for Assignment of Workload. Department chairs and school directors are responsible for assigning workload and ensuring an equitable distribution across the program area (BP 2-3-401-[3]). In cases in which the chair or director is not in the same discipline or a program area, he or she consults with

another faculty member who is in the same field. Department chairs and school directors “*may use differential workloads and/or staffing to ensure that faculty talents support programmatic needs.*”

- ❖ **Implementation Recommendation 3.** Chairs and directors codify the equating factors that are relevant in their units when adjusting a faculty member’s workload from a standard model and the methods they use to ensure an “*equitable distribution across the program area*” (BP 2-3-401[I]) and conditions in which “*faculty talents support programmatic needs*” [IV]. As with college-level endeavors, it may be necessary to approach this task in steps, such that major factors are defined initially and other factors are added over time as deemed important. We encourage chairs and directors to formalize equating factors and methods *beginning in Fall 2013 and finishing by May 2014.*

- ❖ **Implementation Recommendation 4.** The Assistant Vice President for Research aggregates information on the kinds of workload adjustments that are made on campus. To accomplish this objective, deans, chairs, and directors will be asked annually for their emerging workload schemes and data on faculty work assignments. From our review of practices at other institutions and on our own campus, a variety of arrangements seem plausible, depending on size and responsibilities within a department or school. Non-exhaustive examples might include:
 - A full professor who is an excellent teacher and demonstrates active engagement in his or her field increases the instructional load, shifting from a college-standard of three 3-credit-hour classes per semester to four 3-credit-hour classes with limited expectations for scholarship.⁴
 - A research-active faculty member obtains a course reassignment in order to conduct time-intensive scholarship for one of the two semesters during the academic year. Two other faculty members in the school have research-intensive loads for the semester. The school makes up lost student credit hours through a combination of scheduling and staffing adjustments. One previously scheduled course with 40 students is removed from the schedule in advance, and additional seats are opened in three other sections of the course (pending a plan to maintain quality of instruction). One low-enrolled course, typically delivered annually, is changed to being offered every other year.
 - A small department with little flexibility in staffing or enrollment receives support from the dean or another source for adjunct dollars to replace a faculty member who would like to prepare a fellowship application.
 - A large school offering baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral programs allows its faculty to earn credits toward reassignment from teaching nonscheduled, tuition-generating activities (e.g., directed studies, dissertation credits) that are not counted as part of the teaching assignment. When faculty members have banked a sufficient number of credits, they may apply for reassignment from a course and be given an elevated RSCW load. [Variants are implemented in the School of Psychological Sciences and the School of Teacher Education]
 - A faculty member who chairs an important campus-wide initiative, contributes to his or her discipline as an officer in national organization, and carries out service in the department may have an amplified service responsibility and smaller than usual RSCW load or instructional assignment.
 - A college establishes possible concentrations in areas of instruction, research, and service and specifies that these assignments are tied to the evaluation process. In the Differential Staffing

⁴ Being at the forefront of an academic specialization is one of several elements of high-quality instruction in a public doctoral research university. Currency and intellectual engagement are aptly demonstrated by peer-reviewed research, scholarship, and creative works (RSCW). Such contributions ideally enliven instruction and provide a forum for meaningful apprenticeships with students. Given the intertwined relationships between RSCW and instruction, the Research Advisory Council encourages all tenured faculty members to maintain at least a minimum commitment to RSCW. Pre-tenure faculty members most certainly need to maintain active programs in RSCW in order to be promoted. The level of commitment will vary significantly across tenured faculty members, particularly in the full professor ranks, and can serve as a factor in workload adjustments.

and Workload Plan of the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, three types of differential staffing are encouraged (under certain conditions described in that document):

- *Teaching Professor: A tenured professor or a term faculty member may request that his/her workload assignment be adjusted to reflect increased interest in teaching. Such a faculty member could teach four or five classes per semester, with limited or no expectations in either scholarship or service. The faculty member would be required to attend faculty meetings. The reassignment would be reevaluated at agreed upon intervals with the reevaluation completed as part of the annual review cycle. Eligibility for merit pay would be based on performance in the faculty member's agreed upon workload distribution.*
- *Research Professor: A tenured professor may request that his/her workload assignment be adjusted to reflect increased interest and productivity in scholarship and grant writing. In exceptional cases a faculty member with a very strong record of scholarship may be hired into a Research Professor position. Such a reassignment could, for example, be in the form of a one-course reassignment from teaching or a three-credit reassignment from service. The reassignment would be reevaluated at agreed upon intervals with the reevaluation completed as part of the annual review cycle. Eligibility for merit pay would be based on performance in the faculty member's agreed upon workload distribution.*
- *Service Professor: A tenured professor may request that his/her workload assignment be adjusted to reflect increased interest and productivity in service. Such a reassignment could, for example, be in the form of a one-course reassignment from teaching or a three-credit reassignment from scholarship. The reassignment would be reevaluated at agreed upon intervals with the reevaluation completed as part of the annual review cycle. Eligibility for merit pay would be based on performance in the faculty member's agreed upon workload distribution. http://www.unco.edu/cebs/pdfs/Differential_Staffing_Workload_Plan.pdf*

We recommend that data begin to be collected in Spring 2015 with an initial report at the end of Fall 2015.

❖ **Implementation Recommendation 5.** Differentiated workloads are negotiated by the faculty member and his or her chair or director. Except under exceptional circumstances, the arrangements are the result of a voluntary decision by the faculty member. A possible process for determining a differentiated workload follows:

- As early as possible during Fall Semester, discussions about a differentiated workload for the next academic year are initiated by the faculty member, chair, or director (and other representatives from the same academic area in cases in which the supervisor is from a different area, so as to be consistent with BP). The faculty member describes his or her record in the area of a potential workload increase and plans for the time.
- If the faculty member is encouraged to proceed by the chair or director, he or she and the chair or director prepare a differentiated workload agreement, identifying adjustments, expected outcomes, and time limit for the agreement (for a minimum of one semester and a maximum of two academic years). The chair or director develops a plan to cover the expenses.
- Approved plans for differentiated workload are communicated with all faculty members in the department or school by the chair or director. The chair or director also advises the dean of the plan by sending him or her a copy of it. In cases in which additional resources are needed, the chair or director consults with the dean about any possible sources of funds before approving the plan. It is anticipated that additional funds will be rarely available.
- A faculty member who disagrees with the assigned workload may discuss this disagreement with the dean (as per BP, 2-3-401[3] (IV)).

- The faculty member on differentiated workload includes the plan and outcomes as part of the faculty evaluation review so that faculty colleagues, chairs and directors, and deans can assess the yield from the concerted time investment.
- At the end of the term for the differentiated workload agreement, the faculty member reverts back to the standard load and is eligible, contingent on satisfactory progress during the previous arrangement, for reapplication of a differentiated workload.
- Faculty members on differentiated workload can request a return to a standard assignment if circumstances necessitate.

(This sequence of steps is adapted from recommendations by a task force in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Colorado at Denver).

We recommend that these steps be implemented in *Fall 2013*.

- ❖ **Implementation Recommendation 6.** Tenure-track faculty and associate professors, and their chairs and directors, carefully consider the repercussions of a differentiated workload for progress in areas necessary for promotion. For example, it would typically not be advisable for pre-tenure faculty to enter into a workload that increased teaching at the expense of RSCW. Implications should be addressed in writing for faculty in units, with a suggested date beginning *Fall 2013*.
- ❖ **Implementation Recommendation 7.** Schools and departments are encouraged to institute differentiated workload when directors, chairs, and faculty members therein determine that it is *in the best interest of the units* to deploy faculty in this manner. This recommendation is applicable immediately.

Monitoring of Workload. The Chief Academic Officer is “*responsible for monitoring college workload assignments and providing appropriate reports...*” (BP 1-1-303[1]).

- ❖ **Implementation Recommendation 8.** Given Board Policy and complexities inherent in defining equating factors in workload and implementing differentiated workload for individual faculty members, workload practices should be monitored. Chairs, directors, and deans annually review instances of differential staffing to ensure that they do not adversely affect the functioning of the unit or services to students through, for example, excessively large sections of courses, reductions in student credit hours, or infrequently scheduled required courses. Deans prepare spreadsheets of workload units for their faculty in which standard loads are distinguished from assignments higher or lower than usual in instruction, scholarship, or service. With these data in hand, the Provost (and other concerned members of the campus community) evaluate differentiated workload practices and initiate discussions about the need for revisions to workload practices. We recommend that this practice be instituted beginning *Spring 2015*.

Summary. Distinctions among a faculty member’s instruction, service, and scholarship are artificial in that efforts in the separate domains clearly overlap and converge on knowledge production. Even so, there are occasions when duties in the three areas might be constructively demarcated and adjusted such that faculty members and units can better achieve their goals. In order to be implemented effectively, however, differentiated workload needs to be transparent, equitable, aligned with faculty career levels and evaluation processes, and institutionally monitored.

Recommendations for Implementing Differentiated Workload for Faculty

Coda of Comments

After a lengthy period of developing an initial documentation of recommendations for implementing differentiated workload for faculty, a previous draft of this document was circulated to deans and AVPs and subsequently revised. Thereafter, on February 13th, the revised draft was sent to chairs, directors, and program coordinators with a request for feedback from them and from faculty in their units. A deadline for comments was set for March 8th.

The following comments were received, and in most cases led to specific revisions in the document. The Research Advisory Council sincerely thanks everyone for reading and commenting on the document. The wording included in this report (above) reflects these revisions.

Need for the Document. A couple of chairs wondered why this document is needed (at all) given that differentiated workload is permissible in Board Policy. The rationale for the document can be found in the beginning of the document. As elaboration, there has been considerable interest in this topic, and numerous faculty members have advised us in various settings that they would like to take advantage of differentiated workload but are unsure how to go about it and do not know if it is even possible or welcomed given current financial realities. Thus, it appeared worthwhile to us in the Research Advisory Council to communicate that (1) differentiated workload is permissible, and in fact, welcome under certain circumstances, (2) a range of models have been implemented thus far at UNC and in other settings, (3) similar practices have been promoted at other institutions as well, and (4) effective implementation of workload assignments merits the kind of institutional analysis offered in the document.

Affirming the Collective Good. One faculty member suggested that differentiated workload could be used to benefit an individual's research career at the expense of needs within the unit or without regard for the goals of the unit as a whole. We revised the document with this very important issue in mind. This concern underscores the value of discussions within academic programs and colleges regarding shared goals in implementing differentiated workload.

Other Motivations? One Chair wondered if this initiative was a way to redistribute resources from one college to another or to some units from other units within colleges. We respectfully answer that should we have wanted to suggest redistributions of funds, we in the Research Advisory Council would have made such recommendations directly and explicitly.

Role of Deans in Workload Assignments. According to Board Policy, chairs and directors assign workloads of individual faculty members; deans are not involved in this assignment. Therefore, in the steps for assigning workload in Implementation Recommendation 5, the suggestion that deans approve a differentiated workload has been removed, as were several other references to similar involvements by deans. This is a substantive revision made in response to a comment from four chairs.

College Mandates for Workload. Four Chairs raised the concern that workload is in the jurisdiction of chairs and directors, and that deans should have a circumscribed role, such as defining the relationship between lab and lecture courses. It was also suggested that there should be no references to college "policies or criteria" related to workload. It is not the intention of this document to write new *policy* but rather to inform implementation. On this particular issue, we went back to Board Policy to ensure that Recommendations 1 and 2 were carefully articulated.

Board Policy assigns colleges the rights and responsibility to define workload components:

“each college will define the workload components of instruction, scholarship and services as appropriate to the disciplines and the professions they represent. Workload assignments will:

- (a) maintain high quality, and academically sound programs.*
- (b) facilitate the accomplishment of program area, department, school, college, and University goals in teaching, scholarship and service.*
- (c) facilitate the professional development of faculty.*
- (d) maintain student credit hour production and numbers of majors and other students served.*
- (e) link workload to evaluation for promotion, tenure, and compensation discussions.*
- (f) adhere to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education standards for contact time per credit hour.”*

[Board Policy (2-3-401[1]), emphasis added].

Board policy also refers to *“college equating practices”* in the context of determining factors that influence faculty effort (BP 2-3-401[2]; emphasis added). In this context, BP states:

The following are among additional factors that influence faculty effort and might be considered in the development of college equating practices: student credit hours generated; number of contact hours; class size; class level; honors designation; number of instructors (team teaching); number of course preparations; previous experience in teaching a course; development of a new course; off-site instruction; use of distance learning technologies; inclusion of new pedagogical or technological strategies for classroom instruction; direction of performance ensembles; supervision and/or coordination of practica, internships, field experiences, participation in partnership schools and directed studies; supervision of student research, both undergraduate and graduate levels; supervision of undergraduate theses, master’s theses, and doctoral dissertations; advising load and level; scholarly productivity; and responsibilities for program administration. BP 2-3-401(2)

BP is very clear, then, that colleges are *required* to develop workload components and equating practices.

Thus, in our interpretation, colleges have the right and responsibility to establish workload components and equating factors. How they accomplish this work is of course important, and the concerns have led us to reword and in some cases add clarifying statements. To accentuate the desirability of a collaborative process, we made these changes:

- We added the following statement to Recommendation 1: *“These standard assignments may need to vary among academic programs, with chairs, directors, and faculty members contributing to development of one model, or a family of models, of workload within the college.”*
- In Recommendation 2, we have added a statement that the materials are developed in consultation with chairs, directors, and faculty members.
- In Recommendation 3, we removed the reference to consistency with the college model.
- We changed timelines so that colleges and schools and departments are working at the same time and ideally informing one another.

One Model. The Monfort College of Business model was described by a few Chairs in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences and one Faculty Member in the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences as a poor exemplar of desirable practice, for several reasons, such as that it purportedly encourages investments in short-term products at the expense of long-term projects such as books. The MCB model was retained in the document due to our desire to recognize diversity in workload schemes, the fact that the model is consistent with MCB’s accreditation requirements, and the origin of these concerns being outside MCB. We have clarified that the model is not transportable to other colleges by stating: *“The particular models that work for one college will not necessarily work for another.”*

Instructional Overload. A concern was raised that the document did not explicitly take a stand on whether or not faculty members who are teaching in an overload capacity would be eligible for a differentiated workload assignment. It is not the intention of the Research Advisory Council to suggest that a faculty member working in an overload capacity be restricted from the option of a differentiated workload assignment.

Potential Misuse of “Frequent Flyer” Programs. A concern was raised that defined arrangements that allow faculty members to earn credit toward a reduced instructional load by teaching a specified number of non-scheduled courses (e.g., dissertation hours, directed studies, apprenticeships) could be subject to misuse by individuals who are motivated *not* by genuine instructional intentions but instead by the desire to aggregate credits so as to “get out” of a class. An over-emphasis on policing faculty is not warranted or beneficial, in our opinion, but chairs and directors may wish to remain vigilant as to possible negative repercussions of such programs and to informally monitor the quality of learning outcomes if such a concern arises.

Evaluation. A faculty member’s workload has serious implications for Evaluation. This was a primary concern of deans and AVPs but also by faculty members. It is addressed in this document with the recommendation that a differentiated workload be shared with other members of the department or school and that the agreement is included in the Evaluation dossier.

Administrative Burden of Aggregating Data on Workload and Assigning Workload. It was suggested that Recommendation 4, which suggests that deans, Directors, and chairs will be asked by the AVPR for emerging workload schemes and data on faculty work assignments is burdensome. This data collection is necessary in order for the Provost to be able to monitor workload, a responsibility that is articulated in BP (BP 1-1-303[1]). It was also suggested that the steps in Recommendation 5, which outline procedures for assigning and documenting workload, are onerous. The Research Advisory Council cannot imagine a worthwhile workload agreement that does not involve a discussion and documentation of a differentiated assignment. In fact, it is essential from our vantage point that the agreement is shared with colleagues and re-visited during the faculty evaluation process.

Challenges with Resources. Several individuals suggested that they would like to implement differentiated workload but had insufficient resources and flexibility within the unit. We appreciate that resource constraints will severely limit what is possible within academic programs. Unfortunately, we do not have any advice that would help a unit to overcome these constraints. However, we also recognize that some departments and schools are able to take advantage of differentiated workload and should have guidance in doing so.

Difficulty in Defining Workload. One chair noted that it is not simply number of classes that enters into a faculty member’s load but that other factors, such as number of preparations, can be equally consequential. We agree completely and find this observation to be consistent with Board Policy. We also acknowledge that there is a degree of clinical judgment that enters into a chair’s or director’s assignment of workload. It is our opinion that making an attempt at defining significant factors in workload could potentially help with issues of transparency and equity in assignments.

Eligibility for Differentiated Workload. One Chair suggested that language regarding the evaluation performance of Faculty Members should be removed as a selection criterion for a differentiated workload because the Chair may decide that a Faculty Member who has not performed at par in a particular area may show the disposition, capacity, and motivation to develop greater expertise in it and therefore could benefit

from a differentiated workload. We found this a convincing argument and removed the recommendation regarding curtailing differentiated workload by evaluation outcomes.

Teacher-Scholar Model. One Chair asserted that the document did not adequately honor the venerable role of teacher-scholar. We weren't sure how to address this concern because (1) we hold this role near and dear to our hearts, too; and (2) the document frames the rationale within the teacher-scholar model. However, we did amplify examples of cases in which faculty might wish to take reassignments for purposes of increasing time for teaching or service, thus rounding out the portrayal of the professor's duties and acknowledging the many circumstances in which differentiated workload may come into play.

Credit-Hour Production. A few Chairs and Directors (probably all, in reality) are strapped by credit-hour production requirements yet not fully certain of what their obligations are in this area. This is a very important issue and should be raised at different levels, including in colleges and centrally, in Academic Affairs.

Length of Document. It's too long. *Amen!* The complexity of the issues and our desire to address comments contributed to a lengthy document. Following this coda of comments is a brief 2-page planning document.

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO

Planning Document to Accompany
Recommendations for Implementing Differentiated Workload for Faculty

March 27, 2013

Implementation Recommendation	Units Responsible	Date to Begin Task	Targeted Date for Completion
<p>1. To clarify the nature of standard assignments and acceptable deviations from these assignments, each college specifies typical workload divisions or the ranges in allocation for the 30 annual workload units in instruction, scholarship, and service for full-time faculty. These standard assignments may need to vary among academic programs, with chairs, directors, and faculty members contributing to development of one model, or a family of models, of workload within the college.</p>	<p>Deans in consultation with chairs, directors, and faculty</p>	<p>Fall Semester 2013</p>	<p>May 2014</p>
<p>2. Colleges, in consultation with their departments and schools, formalize the particular factors or combinations of factors that determine workload for full-time faculty in their units. These factors are complex, but those considered to be of consequence in workload assignments should be clearly articulated. Deans, chairs and directors, and faculty members may find it helpful to prioritize certain factors initially and then develop a more comprehensive system over time.</p>	<p>Deans in consultation with chairs, directors, and faculty</p>	<p>Fall Semester 2013</p>	<p>May 2014</p>
<p>3. Chairs and directors codify the equating factors that are relevant in their units when adjusting a faculty member's workload from a standard model and the methods they use to ensure an "equitable distribution across the program area" (BP 2-3-401[II]) and conditions in which "faculty talents support programmatic needs" [IV]. As with college-level endeavors, it may be necessary to approach this task in steps, such that major factors are defined initially and other factors are added over time as deemed important.</p>	<p>Chairs and directors in consultation with faculty</p>	<p>Fall Semester 2013</p>	<p>May 2014</p>
<p>4. The Assistant Vice President for Research aggregates information on the kinds of workload adjustments that are made on campus. To accomplish this objective, deans, chairs, and directors will be asked annually for their emerging workload schemes and data on faculty work assignments. From our review of practices at other institutions and on our own campus, a variety of arrangements seem plausible, depending on size and responsibilities within a department or school.</p>	<p>Assistant Vice President for Research, in consultation with deans, chairs, and directors</p>	<p>Spring 2015</p>	<p>Fall 2015</p>

Implementation Recommendation	Units Responsible	Date to Begin Task	Targeted Date for Completion
<p>5. Differentiated workloads are negotiated by the faculty member and his or her chair or director. Except under exceptional circumstances, the arrangements are the result of a voluntary decision by the faculty member. (See recommended steps in determining and communicating differentiated workload.)</p>	<p>Chairs and directors; and faculty</p>	<p>Fall 2013</p>	<p>Fall 2013</p>
<p>6. Tenure-track faculty and associate professors, and their chairs and directors, carefully consider the repercussions of a differentiated workload for progress in areas necessary for promotion. For example, it would typically not be advisable for pre-tenure faculty to enter into a workload that increased teaching at the expense of RSCW. Implications should be addressed in writing for faculty in units.</p>	<p>Chairs and directors; and faculty</p>	<p>Fall 2013</p>	<p>Fall 2013</p>
<p>7. Schools and departments are encouraged to institute differentiated workload when directors, chairs, and faculty members therein determine that it is in the best interest of the units to deploy faculty in this manner.</p>	<p>Chairs and directors in consultation with faculty</p>	<p>Now</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>8. Given Board Policy and complexities inherent in defining equating factors in workload and implementing differentiated workload for individual faculty members, workload practices should be monitored. Chairs, directors, and deans annually review instances of differential staffing to ensure that they do not adversely affect the functioning of the unit or services to students through, for example, excessively large sections of courses, reductions in student credit hours, or infrequently scheduled required courses. Deans prepare spreadsheets of workload units for their faculty in which standard loads are distinguished from assignments higher or lower than usual in instruction, scholarship, or service. With these data in hand, the Provost (and other concerned members of the campus community) evaluate differentiated workload practices and initiate discussions about the need for revisions to workload practices.</p>	<p>Chairs, directors, deans, AVPR, Provost, faculty</p>	<p>Spring 2015</p>	<p>Fall 2015</p>