



QUANTIFYING THE UNQUANTIFIABLE

CREATING A WORKABLE WORKLOAD POLICY

Jeffery Elwell, President, Eastern New Mexico University

George Hynd, Interim Dean, CAS, UT-Chattanooga

Matt Matthews, Assoc. Dean, CAS, UT-Chattanooga

CHAPTER 1

2014-2015 – Provost empanels large committee to build university-level faculty workload policy, includes faculty and department heads across colleges

Policy draft is submitted, reviewed, never enacted

Down the memory hole...

CHAPTER 2

One year later...

2016-2017 – Provost empanels small committee to build university-level faculty workload policy, includes four heads from two of four academic colleges

Policy draft is submitted, reviewed, presented by provost to Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate ends year with no action

Down the memory hole...

CHAPTER 3

2016-2017: College of Arts & Sciences obtains permission to build own faculty workload policy

Example policies from peer institutions are collected, examined

During fall semester, draft built around principles learnt from previous two years

Vetted by department heads and faculty across college

Feedback fed into revised version

Final version endorsed by department heads in spring

Accepted by Provost over the summer

CHAPTER 3

What principles?

- Build from established norms
- Empower department heads to assign workloads
- Respect departmental roles
- Incorporate faculty ideas
- Dean retains final say as necessary
- Avoid points systems which invite arbitrage

Goldilocks Principle: Not too much, not too little

ESTABLISHED NORMS

Borrows heavily from UTC Faculty Handbook (pro-faculty)

- *As described in the UTC Faculty Handbook, a faculty member's assignment serves to further the "three broad substantive areas" which define how UTC accomplishes its mission: Instruction, Research, and Public Service.*

Teaching output framed around Delaware Norms (pro-admin)

- *The National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (colloquially known as The Delaware Study) provides a set of department-specific productivity measures, typically in terms of student credit hours (or SCH), and the College shall annually set average teaching workload expectations based on these measures.*

EMPOWER HEADS

EDO (annual evaluation system) used to assign workload, measure outcomes

- *Within annual EDO evaluations, the head of each department will be responsible for assessing each faculty member against the department's research, scholarship, or creative activity workload guidelines.*

Department heads lead and manage

- *Each department head will be responsible for assigning individual fall semester teaching workloads in an equitable manner that serves student, programmatic, and institutional needs.*

RESPECT ROLES

A department requires faculty in a variety of roles

- *Each faculty member's role within the department should be considered carefully when the department head assigns teaching workloads.*

Relationship between teaching and scholarship

- *The differentiation among faculty types provides for appropriate teaching loads for faculty members with a research, scholarship, or creative activity expectation. Faculty members who maintain scholarly productivity, as defined by the department's bylaws [...] will remain eligible for a lower teaching load to permit continued activity.*

Tenure-track and Non-tenure track

- *Lecturers, clinical instructors, and visiting faculty are exempt from those additional faculty obligations.*

FACULTY IDEAS

Two rounds of input from faculty and department heads

Percentages for three areas adjusted to accommodate NTT faculty

Recognition of faculty-guided research or honors projects

Language to recognize creative activity as a type of scholarship

- Was not in handbook

Many concerns rooted in “we like our handbook”

- Twelve semester hours vs. SCH production

Ultimately endorsed unanimously by department heads

DEAN ENFORCES

Setting teaching requirements for departments

- *Each department head will be responsible for assigning individual fall semester teaching workloads in an equitable manner that serves student, programmatic, and institutional needs. [...]*
Finally, the department productivity average should reach at least 95% of the expectation set by the College.

Setting teaching requirements for faculty

- *Exceptions to these ranges may be granted on a per-semester, per-faculty basis with prior approval of the College.*

Department bylaws set standards for scholarship, service

But the dean must approve bylaws!

AVOID ARBITRAGE

Used broad ranges for big three areas

Teaching around the norms very broad

Left bickering about scholarship, service value to departments

When a baroque point system exists, clever academics will find the exploits

Example system, courses with contact hours in excess of credit hours

- *[In this example the] three additional contact hours exceeding credit hours may be multiplied by a factor of 0.5 and then added to the credit hour value of the course as shown below:*

$$6 \text{ Contact Hrs.} - 3 \text{ Credit Hrs.} = 3 \text{ Excess Hrs.} \times 0.5 \text{ Factor} = 1.5 + 3 \text{ Cr. Hr.} = 4.5 \text{ ACH}$$

CHAPTER 4

2016-2017: Implementation!

Actually too late to set all fall semester expectations, but heads understood

Some departments embraced

- English developed own policy, moved scholars to 3-3 load
- One head set workloads according to policy, faculty member retired

Others struggled

- BGES has 0 (zero) credit hour labs paired with 4 credit hour lectures – wreaks havoc
- Mathematics adjusted all courses to have equal SCH production (108 SCH per section)

CHAPTER 4

Still dealing with arbitrage

- Adjunct assignments still measured in semester credit hours
- Faculty assignments in student credit hours
- Academic Affairs has expressed concern over Delaware norms, reverts to speaking about sections again

As expected adjunct and overload budgets have been affected

- Some departments were teaching overall 150% of Delaware norm
- Now can justify request for adjunct/overload support

Moreover, College can point to total teaching output of 125-140%

REPORTING

Rank	201440	201520	201540	201620	201640	201720	201740	201440	201520	201540	201620	201640	201720	201740
NTT	604	484	510	539	551	611	393	163%	130%	137%	145%	149%	165%	106%
NTT	300	336	447	327	366	336	375	81%	91%	120%	88%	99%	91%	101%
NTT	123	262	216	363	273	246	264	33%	71%	58%	98%	74%	66%	71%
T/TT	1524	819	1479	1209	1872	1128	2253	646%	347%	627%	512%	793%	478%	955%
T/TT	441	684	480	627	561	576	567	187%	290%	203%	266%	238%	244%	240%
T/TT					173	250	524	--	--	--	--	73%	106%	222%
T/TT	168	201	325	391	477	341	384	71%	85%	138%	166%	202%	144%	163%
T/TT					264	222	351	--	--	--	--	112%	94%	149%
T/TT	262	330	248	377	356	258	345	111%	140%	105%	160%	151%	109%	146%
T/TT	419	221	306	297	5	315	321	178%	94%	130%	126%	2%	133%	136%
T/TT			228	177	313	341	300	--	--	97%	75%	133%	144%	127%
T/TT	168	237	225	288	228	243	256	71%	100%	95%	122%	97%	103%	108%
T/TT	126	219	123	204	144	225	240	53%	93%	52%	86%	61%	95%	102%
T/TT	293	256	255	267	398	329	232	124%	108%	108%	113%	169%	139%	98%
T/TT	182	288	296	329	291	315	211	77%	122%	125%	139%	123%	133%	89%
T/TT	288	171	187	285	269	315	200	122%	72%	79%	121%	114%	133%	85%
T/TT							159	--	--	--	--	--	--	67%

REPORTING

Fall 2017	T/TT					NTT					Overall
	FTE	SCH	Norm	If 100%	Rate	FTE	SCH	Norm	If 100%	Rate	
Art	9.5	1633	136	1292	126%	4	588	155	620	95%	116%
Biology	14.83	3339	206	3055	109%	6	1866	299	1794	104%	107%
Chemistry	8.5	2765	216	1836	151%	4	1493	237	948	157%	153%
Communication	8	3164	187	1496	211%	1	174	253	253	69%	191%
Criminal Justice	9	2708	236	2124	127%	1	600	331	331	181%	135%
English	20.5	3492	165	3383	103%	28	6675	224	6272	106%	105%
Env. Science	3.5	764	186	651	117%	1	356	242	242	147%	125%
Geology	4	1008	214	856	118%	N/A	N/A	285	N/A	N/A	118%
History	9.5	2565	202	1919	134%	3	984	307	921	107%	125%
Mathematics	16	4114	224	3584	115%	10	5584	313	3130	178%	144%
MCLL	7.5	1516	151	1133	134%	4	975	205	820	119%	128%
Music	12.5	1449	108	1350	107%	1	29	123	123	24%	100%
Phil. & Rel.	4.5	1107	209	941	118%	2	702	359	718	98%	109%
Physics	4	1106	187	748	148%	1	308	288	288	107%	136%
PSPS	8.5	2582	206	1751	147%	1	264	306	306	86%	138%
Psychology	13.5	6343	236	3186	199%	3	1032	371	1113	93%	172%
SAG	9.5	3447	242	2299	150%	3	1566	374	1122	140%	147%
Theatre	3.5	597	142	497	120%	3	981	160	480	204%	162%

CAS	43699	32099	136%	24177	19481	124%	132%
-----	-------	-------	------	-------	-------	------	------

TAKEAWAYS

Designing effective workload policy is hard, so...

1. Use existing documents, leverage familiarity during change
2. Revise with faculty input, build buy-in
3. Respect department variability
4. Empower closest responsible admin (dept head) with flexibility
5. Praise the early adopters, press against the resistance
6. Report data regularly, with transparency

QUESTIONS?

CONTACT US

Jeffery Elwell

Jeff.Elwell@enmu.edu

George Hynd

George-Hynd@utc.edu

Matt Matthews

Matt-Matthews@utc.edu

**THANK
YOU**

