This document is only for purposes of discussion. The following may not be the final recommendations made by the committee. The final recommendations will bear in mind faculty members' feedback on May 11, 2016; Summer 2016; and Fall 2016.

Timeline:
May 11, 2016: discuss recommendations at A&S faculty meeting
May-August, 2016: post recommendations online and solicit feedback
Early June 2016: workload committee meets to discuss draft committee report
June 2016: post committee's report online
September 2016: committee meets to discuss feedback received online
September/October, 2016: ask for vote of support for recommendations at an A&S faculty meeting
Goal for 2016-2017: pilot our recommendations with an eye to make adjustments to the recommendations during Summer 2017 and implement revised recommendations in Fall 2017. This cycle of adjustments would probably have to be implemented for a few years and the recommendations would need to be revisited on a regular basis

Goals:
1. Allow for more flexibility for faculty to focus on their strengths
2. Enable faculty to have more manageable and desirable workloads
3. Ensure a more equitable sharing of the necessary teaching, advising, and service work
4. Enable faculty a voice in workload decisions in their department
Workload Recommendations

Shifting workload:
Our recommendations allow for “trade-offs,” substitutions, or shifting in faculty workload in a “mix-and-match” kind of way. The goal is for a faculty member’s workload to be flexible and match their strengths. Therefore, we encourage shifting between the areas described below to account for faculty interest, strengths, and departmental-specific policies. Faculty can do less work in one area if they do more in another. Moving forward, faculty will be allowed to shift their workload in the areas of teaching, service, and advising in ways that match their strengths or be compensated for work they do which is over and beyond their expected workload by re-allocating work in the areas of teaching, service, and advising.

Given our recommendations, it should be possible for faculty to:
• focus on the kinds of activities for which they have comparative strengths (teaching, advising, service, and/or research-related teaching for tenure-track and tenured faculty) and
• re-allocate work (i.e., do less teaching, advising, and/or service) when they are doing more work in other areas. For faculty who are interested, our recommendations allow for ways to reduce teaching loads by focusing activities on research-related teaching (running laboratories, advising of independent research such as senior honors theses, masters theses, and doctoral dissertations), advising, and service.

Current department practices:
Many departments already have processes that allow for trading-off of work. In such cases, department workload “committees” (see below) should build on the work that has already been done. In other cases, departments have been concurrently developing their own workload accounting systems. Again, these initiatives are entirely compatible with our recommendations. Our recommendations allow for variations in composition of standard workload, provide faculty with more control over how to balance their workload, allow for determining workload on a case-by-case (individual) basis, and provide flexibility.

Areas of potential reorganization:
Our Spring 2016 survey has identified three areas of potential reorganization (or “savings”) within workload: committee work, advising, and low enrollment courses. The results of our survey indicate that the first two areas contribute significantly to faculty workload.
• In terms of committee work, we recommend that the Committee on Committees review the number of committees as well as the number of faculty serving on each committee. It may be that committees could function with fewer faculty members.
• In terms of advising, informal advising especially takes a heavy toll on faculty, which may reflect problems with both pre-major and major advising. We recommend that EPC take on a review of advising during 2016-2017, with the goal of simplifying the process. This process will require working with our colleagues in Dowling Hall to reform and simplify our approach to advising. This may or may not require a review of the curriculum as well, looking for ways to streamline our students’ requirements and provide them with more flexibility.
• In terms of low enrollment courses, we recommend that, whenever possible, we avoid offering low enrollment courses (courses with fewer than six students). In 2015-2016, close to 20% of courses had fewer than 10 students. Small courses are of course needed in certain kinds of circumstances. However, when not necessary to meet students’ curricular needs, departments and programs should consider offering low
enrollment courses less frequently. Attending to these areas of potential efficiency may provide us all with more flexibility to re-arrange workload and may allow faculty to focus their attention on activities that they find more rewarding and for which they have comparative strengths.

Department Workload “Committees:”
We recommend that each department establish a workload “committee,” if it doesn’t already exist, with representatives from all ranks (i.e., Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors, as well as Full-Time Lecturers in departments that have them). Some departments may not need new “committees” but instead take advantage of currently existing committees or groups of faculty (department curriculum committees, program directors, etc.)—the key is to have representatives from all ranks involved in the conversations. This “committee” would meet one or two times a year. Department workload “committees” would not make decisions about individuals but instead use our guidelines, described below, to establish department-level “formulas” for workload “trade-offs” or substitutions and would establish department-wide recommendations about workload. For example, in one department anything over X advisees would require some workload substitution, while in another department what would make sense is doing so for anything over Y advisees. The “committee” should discuss how workload is allocated and in what ways substitutions and shifting of workload are working and any adjustments that might be needed in this area. All recommendations made should bear in mind that the discretion given to department chairs and department workload “committees” comes with the responsibility to deliver the required curriculum with the department’s resources.

Department workload “committees” should bear in mind the main sources of variation in workload that were identified in the Spring 2016 faculty workload survey (informal advising, senior honors theses, and committees) as they make decisions about substitutions and reallocation of work. For example, since most faculty who are engaged in advising MA students, advising certificate students, or serving on committees that meet three or more hours per week are already trading off in other areas of their workload according to the Spring 2016 faculty workload survey (e.g., teaching less, doing less service), perhaps this model can be used in thinking about how to re-allocate other workload activities.

Proposed process for establishing a faculty member’s workload:
With the guidelines provided in this document, each Department workload “committee” should:

1. Establish, in consultation with the department faculty and department chair, the standard workloads and substitutions that make the most sense for the department and ensure an equitable allocation of workload across faculty in the department. For instance, supervising X number of senior honors theses is equivalent to teaching one course or advising Y number of students. Or, running a lab or research group with X number of undergraduate students, Y graduate students, and Z post-doctoral fellows is equivalent to teaching one course and running a lab with A number of undergraduate students and B graduate students is equivalent to teaching one-half course.

2. Share department proposals with the department’s academic dean.

3. Department chairs would implement the department proposals for individual faculty members.

4. This cycle should be repeated once a year. Step #1 would lead to revisions only when problems have been encountered.

5. Establish a school-wide committee that would meet once a year with academic deans to discuss cross-department issues. This could lead to broadening the school-wide substitutions described below.
Guidelines about Teaching:

- Courses contributing to faculty members’ course load will typically have a minimum enrollment of at least 6 students.
- Team-taught classes that are fully integrated (where instructors attend all class meetings and are responsible for all aspects of the course) may be counted toward their course load. Team-taught classes that are not fully integrated will only count as partial credit towards course load.
- Courses that count towards a faculty member’s course load should not be lab meetings or connected to a faculty member’s research project in which all students act as research assistants of some kind. Instead, these research-related teaching activities can lead to substitutions, as described below.
- When applicable, faculty will supervise (i.e., as committee chair for theses and dissertations) and/or read (note: not all these categories are applicable to all faculty):
  a. undergraduate students’ theses;
  b. undergraduate students’ independent studies or capstone projects;
  c. graduate students’ masters’ theses;
  d. graduate students’ doctoral dissertations; or
  e. graduate students’ independent studies or capstone projects.

Faculty can mix and match a-e, but should work with their Department Chair and Department Workload Committee to make sure they are not overloaded. Many departments are already providing relief for faculty advising masters’ theses. The results of our workload survey show that advising senior honors theses is also significantly taxing on faculty. We recommend that departments also provide relief for faculty advising senior honors theses.

Academic Advising:

- All faculty members will be expected to be academic advisors for undergraduate and/or graduate students. In general, the number of students they advise should be a fair proportion of the students in their department and/or program.

Service:

- All faculty members will be expected to provide service to their Department, the School, and the University.
- For faculty members engaged in leadership positions, their nominal course load will be reduced as follows:
  a. Department chairs: 2 course releases/year
  b. T&P Committee: 2 course releases/year
  c. Director of Graduate Program: 1 course release/year or 1 course release every other year depending on size of program
  d. Director of Undergraduate Program: 1 course release/year or 1 course release every other year depending on size of program
  e. Director of Interdisciplinary Program: between ½ and 2 course releases depending on size of program
  f. Center Director: between 1 and 2 course releases per year depending on the size and scope of the center
Guidelines for substitutions:
Activities in excess of faculty members’ standard workload, such as the following, should be acknowledged by shifting responsibilities in either teaching, service, or advising, following these guidelines (this is not an exhaustive list). Each department workload “committee” should revise these guidelines as needed in consultation with the department’s Academic Dean to make sure they capture the needs of the individuals in their department. The guidelines are informed by the results of our A&S Spring 2016 faculty workload survey and allow “committees” to explore the re-assignment of workload when an individual faculty member exceeds their standard workload. Workload can be reassigned by decreasing their effort in teaching, service, or advising.

Our proposal is for the following guidelines to be piloted in 2016-2017. After this first implementation, the substitutions proposed below would become more precise as departments make recommendations and implement them. Our revision timeline would look as follows:

The following are examples of substitutions that some departments already implement:
Primary advisor for 5 MA/honors theses or PhD dissertations = 1 course
Supervise 8 students’ independent studies/independent research/directed studies = 1 course
Running a laboratory or research group (depending on number of students and post-docs supervised) = between ½ and 1 course

Other areas that chairs identified as needing to be acknowledged but for which we do not yet have proposed equivalencies:
Academic fieldwork and internships
Advising over and beyond the average
Chairing other ad-hoc committees
Conference organization
Directing a community outreach program
Ensemble directors
Evaluation projects on a large scale
Event planning
Extraordinary committee work
Facilities management
Language coordinators
Large-scale projects
Major one-time projects
Mentoring student productions or art shows
Program, curriculum, and course design and development
Reader for MA/honors theses or PhD dissertations
Substantial participation in interdisciplinary programs

Other possible substitutions we identified as already occurring through the Spring 2016 faculty workload survey:

- Substitute pre-major advising, major advising, and university committees for university and department committees requiring three or more hours of work per week.
- Substitute advising MA students, advising certificate students, or serving on committees that meet three or more hours per week for work in other areas of workload (e.g., teaching less, doing less service).
- Substitute advising of MA students, post-docs, informal advising, and supervision of field work and internships for university and department committees requiring three or more hours per week.
- Trade-off MA Advising, MA student supervision, and department committees for course load and pre-major advising.
- Pay special attention to the main sources of variation in workload reported in the Spring 2016 A&S Faculty Workload Survey: informal advising, senior honors theses, and committees.