

Guidance for the revision of College Faculty Workload Guidelines and College/Departmental Annual Review Standards to comport with updated UTS and University Workload Policies

In November of 2017, the University of Texas System adopted new requirements in Regents Rule 31006. Consequently, each member institution was required to update its institutional faculty workload and reporting policy to comport with new requirements, in particular to foster student success and institutional advancement through research excellence (see attached memorandum). UTSA engaged in a stakeholder-engaged process to revise the attendant university policy that meets these requirements, HOP 2.14, Faculty Workload Requirement, <https://www.utsa.edu/hop/chapter2/2-14.html>

Under this policy, the Provost has the responsibility to ensure that each college has college faculty workload guidelines and College/departmental annual review standards that align with, and are supplementary to, the institutional policy. As such, the division of Faculty Success in Academic Affairs has developed a common process by which each college will develop college-level faculty workload guidelines and College/departmental annual review standards that meet a set of minimum standards following the general timeline shown below.

Fall 2019

- Oct: Colleges form representative committees to develop college workload guidelines
- Nov: Committees create guidelines through stakeholder input process,
- Mid Dec: review by College Dean and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to ensure alignment with institutional guidance, goals and policy
- Early Jan: Colleges vote to approve revised College Workload guidelines

Spring 2020

- Jan: Depts. form representative committees to develop/update college/department annual review standards
- Feb-Mid March: Committees create guidelines through stakeholder input process
- Mid-March: review by College Dean and Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs to ensure alignment with College and Institution guidance, goals and policies
- Early April: Department vote to approve drafted annual review standards

The objective is to develop connected and aligned workload assignment and annual review processes, which comport with the revised institutional policy framework for setting of the annual workload for teaching, research, and service for all departmental faculty and the attendant college/departmental annual review standards by which to evaluate the scholarly outcomes of faculty effort.

Colleges shall develop their workload guidelines and the college/departmental annual review standards through a shared governance process. Each college shall form a representative committee to develop college guidelines that must include college and departmental leadership, as well as an equivalent number of representative faculty from each department. This committee should include college faculty and is recommended to include college representatives who serve on the Faculty Senate and Chair's Council. These ensuing draft college workload guidelines will then be reviewed by the college leadership, the Dean, and the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for sufficiency relative to the requirements below. If deemed that further adjustments are needed, the committee will be reconvened to iteratively address the feedback through further revisions of the college workload guidelines for subsequent institutional review.

Overarching values guiding the revision to the College Workload Guidelines

- The workload of each full time and part time faculty member includes teaching, research, service, and when applicable administrative duties, and is determined by the workload guidelines for each college. Therefore, the workload guidelines for each college must cover teaching, research, service, and administrative duties.
- The college and its departments shall meet the instructional obligations to both undergraduate and graduate students and programs. Workload is subject to the needs (budget and programmatic) of the college in consideration of those of the department.
- The college deploys its faculty resources to provide the maximum support for student success and institutional advancement through research and engagement.
- In accordance with the college workload guidelines, individual faculty workload assignments will be determined annually and set by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member, and is approved by the Dean of the College.
- Faculty may vary in their assigned workload distributions in a manner that is consistent with the College and University's mission. Workload distributions (in-load and overload) should be equitable to all faculty of differing rank, disciplinary area, gender, race/ethnicity, etc.
- Each faculty member is in compliance with Texas Education Code 51.402.c.
- Workload guidelines and assignments should be easily accessible to faculty for review.
- Faculty retain the right to appeal workload assignments through the institutional grievance process.
- The annual department evaluation process for faculty shall be aligned with the faculty member's workload assignment, i.e., the departmental annual review standards should align with the college's workload guidelines.
- College workload guidelines should be reviewed at least every five years by the college faculty and leadership.

College Workload Guidelines Requirements

Each college Dean shall submit to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs a draft college workload guideline document that comports with the revised Regents Rule, UT System guidance, UTSA institutional Faculty Workload Requirement HOP 2.14 according to the process stated above for review and consideration by December 11, 2019 that includes the following elements:

- Projects a plan of teaching, research, service and professional development activities for a defined period of one or more years;
 - Contains an explicit statement that the dean or delegate shall assign workload in instances where there is failure to submit a signed faculty workload agreement.
- States specific criteria by which faculty qualify for each available track, including specific research, service and professional development commitments, which utilizes the list of authorized course load release activities in the Guidelines for Application of HOP 2.14.
- States how specific faculty workload is assigned across teaching, research, service, and administration, and the differential workload assignment shall:
 - shall account for discipline-specific best practices and are equitable among all faculty of differing rank, disciplinary area, gender, race, etc.,
 - allow variance over the course of a faculty member's career, and
 - be flexible to the extent possible to that assignment of differential teaching loads allows faculty members to pursue opportunities that enhance the excellence and reputation of the institution, add value to the department, and allow for

- professional growth and innovation in the areas of teaching, research, and service.
 - assign faculty members in the department a Faculty Workload, in consultation with the faculty member that is: a) differential to circumstances such as research activities, effort supported by external grants or contracts, commercialization and/or innovation activities, administrative assignments, large class sizes, team-taught courses, experiential and/or engaged learning activities, graduate instruction expectations and graduate faculty responsibilities, significant mentoring responsibilities, or other activities aligned with the institution's mission and excellence and/or critical to student success; and b) based on the expectations of tenured and tenure-track faculty who have active and productive research/scholarly/creative programs, and tenured faculty who are less active in research/scholarly/ creative work, and all non-tenure track faculty.
 - assign teaching loads that differ for faculty assigned to Teaching Intensive, Balanced and Research Intensive tracks
 - Teaching and instructional activities are defined as those activities that include interaction with students related to instruction, preparation for instruction, mentoring, experiential learning, or coordination of instruction.
 - Teaching loads for each track should be expressed in course equivalents (see below) taught in the two long semesters of the 9-month academic year, where total teaching workload is the sum of assigned teaching workload plus approved teaching workload releases
- Research workload is the percent effort devoted to basic, applied, and translational research, scholarship and creative activity, commercialization, and/or innovation activities.
 - Research, scholarship and creative activities are activities designed to produce research, scholarship and creative activity outcomes by a faculty member, including singularly and as a part of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary and convergence teams, and in commercialization, industry application and development activities, Intellectual Property/patent work.
- Service workload is the percent effort devoted to service and/or professional development activities.
 - Service activities include significant contributions to meeting departmental, college, or university goals, in addition to a faculty member's profession, community and public service related to their discipline at the local, state, national, and international levels.
- Administration workload is the percent effort devoted to administration. An administrative appoint is an assignment given to a faculty member at the department, college, or university level.
- These criteria shall be stated independently of workload releases.
- Includes the institutional and system process for the reporting and approval of the Faculty Workload assignment for each faculty member that comports with the Guidelines for Application of HOP 2.14;

Base System for workload assignment and reporting

Teaching and Instructional Activity:

Teaching and instructional activities are defined as those activities that include interaction with students related to instruction, preparation for instruction, mentoring, experiential learning, or coordination of instruction. The activity metrics at the department level should not differ from the college level.

Table 1 provides the course equivalents for the three workload tracks for tenure/tenure-track faculty for colleges. In addition, for a faculty member to qualify for the Research intensive track, s/he must be a Graduate Faculty Member as defined in the institutional policy.

Table 1: Faculty Workload Tracks and Course Equivalents

	Teaching Intensive	Balanced	Research Intensive
Teaching % - Research % - Service %	80 – 20 (distributed to R or S)	50 – 50(distributed to R-S)	40 – 60(distributed to R-S)
Assistant			<i>Fall: 2 course equivalents – Spring: 2 course equivalents</i>
Associate	<i>Fall: 5 course equivalents – Spring: 5 course equivalents</i>	<i>Fall: 3 course equivalents – Spring: 3 course equivalents</i>	<i>Fall: 2 course equivalents – Spring: 2 course equivalents</i>
Full	<i>Fall: 5 course equivalents – Spring: 5 course equivalents</i>	<i>Fall: 3 course equivalents – Spring: 3 course equivalents</i>	<i>Fall: 2 course equivalents – Spring: 2 course equivalents</i>

The expectation for the workload effort of non-tenure track faculty with titles and duties that are primarily teaching is no less than that for a teaching intensive track tenured/tenure-track faculty member 80 (T)- 20 (distributed R or S). The expectation for the workload for non-tenure track faculty with titles and duties that are primarily research is no less than 80 (R)-20 (distributed T or S).

The maximum teaching load for a faculty member paid through state funds is 100% with a 100% workload distribution. Teaching loads for each track should be expressed in course equivalents (see below) taught in the two long semesters of the 9-month academic year, where total teaching workload is the sum of assigned teaching workload plus approved teaching workload releases.

Table 2 provides the course equivalents by course type and undergraduate and graduate levels, which relates to the workload percentage and the level of the faculty member for teaching, and Table 3 provides instructional activities that qualify for teaching activities and course equivalent for these activities, which relates to the workload percentage.

Table 2: Course Type and Equivalent

Course Type	Characteristics	UG Course Equivalent	Grad Course Equivalent
Lecture 3SCH	<18 students	0.8 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3)	1.0 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3)
Small Lecture 3SCH	19-40 students	1.0 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)	1.2 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)
Medium Lecture 3 SCH	41-71 students	1.2 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)	1.4 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)
Large Lecture 3 SCH	72-144 students	1.4 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)	1.6 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)
Trenta Lecture 3 SCH	≥145 students	1.8 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)	2.0 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3) (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)
Laboratory	≥ 3 hrs/wk	1.0 (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)	1.0 (decrease by 0.2 for every TA assigned)
Laboratory with a Lecture	Use student number above	Increase by 0.4 from lecture size above	Increase by 0.4 from lecture size above
Recitation	≥ 1.5 hrs/wk	0.4	0.4
Seminar	1 SCH	0.4 (increase by 0.2 for every SCH)	0.4 (increase by 0.2 for every SCH)
"single student instruction" Any SCH	Thesis, dissertation, independent study, music lesson, Honors Thesis, etc.	0.6 (increase by 0.2 for every student)	Masters 0.6 (increase by 0.2 for every student) Doctoral 0.8 (increase by 0.2 for every student)
Education Field/teacher training courses	≥ 3 hrs/wk	1.0 (increase by 0.2 for every 5 students)	1.0 (increase by 0.2 for every 5 students)
Honors Course	Taught for Honors College	1.0 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3)	1.2 (decrease by 0.2 for every SCH less than 3)
Studio/Lab 3 SCH	Up to 6 hours/week < 20 students	1.0 (increase by 0.2 for every 5 students)	1.0 (increase by 0.2 for every 5 students)

Studio/Lab 6 SCH	Up to 12 hours/week < 20 students	1.8 (increase by 0.2 for every 5 students)	1.8 (increase by 0.2 for every 5 students)
------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--

Table 3: Instructional Activities and Course Equivalents

Course Type	Characteristics	Course Equivalent
UG Student mentoring	5-20 students, at least 35hrs a semester	1.0 (decrease by 0.2 for every 5 students or increase by 0.2 for every 5 students)
Graduate Student mentoring	3 Masters or 2 PhD, at least 30hrs a semester	0.6 (decrease by 0.2 for every 2 students or increase by 0.2 for every 2 students)
Post-doctoral fellow mentoring	1 Post-doc, at least 20hrs a semester	0.5 (increase by 0.2 for every 1 student)
New Course Development	F2F, online, hybrid	1.0
Course Coordinator	e.g. internship program, field experience, etc.	0.4
Program Coordination	UG or Graduate level program	0.8
UGAR or GAR		1.0
Certificate Coordinator	UG or Graduate level	0.4
FIG/Living Learning Communities, Service Learning coordinator	Activities outside an organized course	0.6
UG Research	3 students	0.4 (increase by 0.2 for every 2 students)
Student organization faculty mentor	If role includes design/build instruction, workshops, or other educational activities	0.4

An instructor can only get credit once for the same activity if in Table 2 and Table 3. For example, if a student is registered for a “single student instruction” then the instructor does not get additional credit for UG or Graduate student mentoring. A thesis or doctoral committee member is considered a service activity not teaching.

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities

Research, scholarship and creative activities are activities designed to produce research, scholarship and creative activity outcomes by a faculty member, including singularly and as part of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary and convergence teams, and in commercialization, industry application and development activities, Intellectual Property/patent work.

Table 4 provides baseline of activities and the related percent of effort to the level of the faculty member. The colleges should determine through their shared governance process what the minimum range and percent effort should be for these activities. Those provided in Table 4 are examples. The activities given must be included but additional activities can be added by the colleges. In addition, percent effort could further be defined by the track of the faculty member.

Table 4: Baseline Research and Creative Activities

Activity	E.g. Min. Range	E.g. Percent Effort		
		Assistant	Associate	Full
Students mentored	3 UG, 3 MS, or 2 PhD	15	25	25
Peer Reviewed Journal Publications	2 per year	10	15	15
Proposals submitted	3 per year	20	15	15
Performances				
Books				
Book Chapters				
Research Expenditures				
High Impact Journals				
Students supported on grants				
Students engaged in faculty research experiences (course or community based)				
Commercialization/ IP/patents				
Industry application and development				

Service Activities:

Service activities are activities that include a faculty member's contribution to departmental, college, or university activities, in addition a faculty member's profession, community and public service related to their discipline at the local, state, national, and international level.

Table 5 provides the baseline of activities, examples of characteristics for some of these activities and the related percent of effort to the level of the faculty member. The colleges should determine through their shared governance process what the percent effort and minimum range should be for these activities. The activities given must be included but additional activities can be added by the colleges. In addition, percent effort could further be defined by the track of the faculty member if appropriate.

Table 5: Baseline Service Activities

Activity	Characteristics/ Min. Range	Percent Effort		
		Assistant	Associate	Full
External				
Conference Session Organizer				
Member of Professional Organization				
Professional Organization Committee Member/Leadership				
Reviewer (Journal or proposals)				
Journal Editor				
Accreditation reviewer				
Community Engagement (reports, expert, etc.)				
Internal				
Department Committees	E.g. DFRAC, Curriculum			
College Committees				
University Committees				
Graduate Thesis/Dissertation Committees				
Student Organizations Faculty Advisor				
Co-curricular activities with students (E.g. competition teams, education abroad not organized courses)				
Extracurricular Activities with Students (E.g. Professional development activities, university sponsored events)				

Administration:

An administrative appoint is an assignment given to a faculty member at the department, college, or university level. Table 6 includes the roles that qualify as an administrative appointment, the percent effort of these appointments, the number of months for the annual supplement and the number of months of summer support. The colleges shall determine the rate of the annual supplement based on number of degree programs, student enrollment, number of faculty, etc.

Table 6: Administrative Appointment Guidelines

Role	% Effort	Annual Supplement	Summer Support
Department Chair	50	12 months	1.5 months
Asst. Dept. Chair	20	12 months	0.5 months
Associate Dean	60	12 months	1.5 months
Asst. Dean	30	12 months	1.0 months
University Transdisciplinary Center/Institute Director	50	12 months	None

Overload:

An overload is defined as teaching an organized course that produces workload in excess of 100% workload distribution in an academic year not including summer (if 9-month contract). Solely exceeding 100% workload distribution does not automatically justify overload compensation.

Courses taught as an overload may not be used for credit towards future responsibilities or meritorious activity if compensation is received in addition to regular salary. Compensation may be in the form of either financial, reduced course load the same or following academic year (if program obligations and budget permit), or adjusted workload assignments in other areas (e.g. research, service, administration).

Summer Teaching:

Colleges should develop a single per course pay rate for summer teaching. This rate could be a sliding scale based on faculty rank but should also include a rate for NTT faculty. It should balance incentive for someone being willing to teach, but also should be less than the monthly, 9 month salary of the faculty member. Department guidelines cannot be different from College guidelines for summer salary.

Alignment with Annual Evaluation Standards:

The annual evaluation process for faculty shall be aligned with the faculty member's workload. The college annual evaluation standards should align with the college's workload guidelines and the department annual evaluation standards should align with the college's workload guidelines. Colleges/Departments should use a shared governance process to update or create their annual evaluation guidelines based on the established workload guidelines. Specific requirements for this Standards document will be forthcoming later this fall.