

CEFNS Work Load Definitions and Assignments

Document History: Starting version from CEFNS 08-09 document – revised (by dsl) and reviewed (and revised) many times by various entities including chairs, faculty, dean, and dean’s office staff. Version 7.0 presented formally to chairs on 1/29/10 for department feedback resulting in revisions, Version 7.2 reviewed by Provost’s office completed 2/18/10 and revisions incorporated. Formal vote by the chairs/directors (who are representing their respective units) to use this policy (known as v 7.3) for 2010-11 on 2/18/10: 7 approved, 1 abstention, 1 missing

This document is a refinement of the workload assignment guidelines developed in 2008-09 that were implemented in 2009-2010. The intent of this refinement is to better capture and more accurately represent the many and varied aspects of faculty work, and to maintain a system of definitions that are common across our college. It also serves as the unit – with unit being defined here as the college – workload policy. This policy is a necessity per the NAU Faculty Handbook Section 5.2 whereby each unit must have an approved¹ document that describes how assignments of student-related responsibilities, scholarly or creative activities, and service activities are developed and how load credit is determined for any specific assignment. The workload assignment appeal process follows that which is outlined in the NAU COFS for establishing SOEs. An individual’s SOE, and thus workload, is the result of negotiation between the faculty member and the chair or director, and when indicated by department policy, the Faculty Status Committee or the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Unit chairs and directors are responsible for the implementation of this policy. They have the authority to use discretion in the interpolation and extrapolation of the definitions and allocations herein to accommodate borderline or uncommon situations. Major policy exceptions, however, shall not be granted, except under extraordinary circumstances and only with the approval of the dean’s office. Similarly, if there is a dispute over assignment, consultation with the dean’s office may be required.

This CEFNS work load document includes: translated summaries of the pertinent NAU criteria found in the faculty handbook and the Provosts October 2008 Ten Points for Effectiveness, load definitions for scholarship and administrative assignments that are pinned to the student-related responsibility base (e.g. starting) load, student-related activity allocations, guidelines for scholarly expectations, and sample AY load calculations.

Key Elements of Faculty Workloads

Table 1 NAU Faculty Handbook Excerpted Criteria

Category	NAU Faculty Handbook 8.15.08	Criteria
Overarching	5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fifteen workload units/semester = full time faculty commitment/semester. • One unit equates, on average, to three hours of work per week. • Laboratory supervision, direction of student research and independent study, administrative assignments, and research or creative activities in the interest of the university are legitimate partial equivalents of credit-hour workload.

¹ Per NAU’s Faculty Handbook Section 5.2, approval is by the faculty, chairs/directors, dean, and provost.

Student-Related Activities	5.2.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 to 70% of TTT² faculty's workload • 80 to 100% of NT³ faculty's workload • Three unit course (e.g. routine, standard) = 10% of AY workload. • Variations to the three unit = 10% rule are permitted to recognize circumstances such as: number of students, number of sections, whether or not teaching assistants provided, co-convening, writing intensive, studio classes, labs, new course development, major course revision, capstone courses.
Scholarly & Creative Activities	5.2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of endeavors must be made available (e.g. disseminated) • Maintain (normally) at least a 20% allocation for TTT faculty • Normally assignment is between 20 to 50% for TTT faculty • Buyout (from student related) is permitted (to increase allocation to scholarship).
Service	5.2.5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation typically ranges between 10 to 20%.

This document utilizes the academic year as the basic time frame. Criterion 5.2 translates to an academic year (AY) workload of 100% equaling thirty workload units whereby one workload unit equals 3.33% of an AY allocation. The college used a 40 hour work week basis to convert workload units to hours per week, while also simultaneously recognizing that faculty will often work more than this basis. It follows that one work load unit = 3.33% of the AY, or 2.67 hours of work per week per semester. A student-related activity load of 60% might then consist of three-3 unit routine and standard courses per semester (e.g. $3 \times .10 \times 2 = .6$ or 24 hours/week). This type of load is often referred to as a 3 + 3 instructional load.

Pertinent Elements of the Provost's October 2008 Ten Points

In response to the economic pressures facing the State of Arizona, the Provost in the fall of 2008 established a ten point memorandum, effective for FY years 2010 and 2011, directing units to examine and revise their then current practices on curriculum, teaching loads, etc. The following are the elements of this ten point memo, which are pertinent to this workload policy:

- **Base line (starting) AY instructional load** is 3 + 3 for tenured and tenure-track (TTT) full-time faculty. The CEFNS has translated this **to be equal to a 60% student related load.**
- **Base line (starting) AY instructional load** is 4 + 4 for non-tenure (NT) full-time faculty, such as lecturers and instructors. The CEFNS has translated this **to be equal to a 80% student-related load.**
- Minimum enrollment requirements per course:
 - Undergraduate course is 15.
 - Graduate course is 8.
 - Co-convened course is 10.

The net work load allocation is displayed in Table 2 for a full time TTT member without additional scholarly buyout, with an instructional load consisting of standard and routine courses, and a regular service load. The standard load of 60% in student-related activities provides a faculty member 30% (or 1.5 days) of his or her week for scholarly activities over the AY.

² TTT refers to tenure-track and tenured faculty

³ NT refers to non-tenure full-time faculty, which include lecturers, instructors, clinical professors, etc.

The implication of the mandated base student-related AY load is that all workload assignments evolve from this 60% base for all TTT or 80% base for all NT faculty.

Table 2 Example AY Workload Allocation for a TTT Faculty

	AY Allocation	Equiv. Workload/Sem. (Units)	Equiv. Workload/AY (Units)	Equiv. Work/ Week (Hours/Days)
Student-Related Activities	60%	9*	18	24 hrs or 3 days
Scholarly & Creative Activities	30%	4.5	9	12 hrs or 1.5 days
Service	10%	1.5	3	4 hrs or .5 days
Total	100%	15	30	40 hrs or 5 days

*Example: Semester basis is 15 units. Therefore: $.6 \times 15 = 9$ units, $9 \text{ units} \times 2.67 \text{ hours} = 24 \text{ hours/week}$.

CEFNS Workload Definitions

Scholarly Expectations

In general and referencing back to the scholarly expectations of the faculty handbook, a 10% annual assignment in scholarship in the CEFNS typically equates to a set of activities that result in one product outcome. Units will need to create a list of products in coordination with the dean's office that are comparable in effort, yet broad enough to accommodate differences in unit and professional career goals. Referring back to Table 2, the 30% scholarship activity comes with the performance expectation of three products during the applicable academic year.

Adjustment (Reduction) to the Base Student Related Load for Administrative Assignments

Administrative assignments include chairs, directors, or other authorized unit administrators. The table below is premised on the mandated 60% student-related starting base with administrative assignments providing a reduction to this base.

Table 3 Reduction in Base Student-Related Load for Administrators

Formally Approved* Administrative Appointments	Reduction in Base AY Student Related Load	Net Student-Related Load from a 60% Base w/o Other Adjustments
Chairs and Directors	50%	10%
Assistant and Associate Chairs	20%	40%
Program Coordinators in multi-program units	10%	50%
Graduate Coordinators	10%	50%

*Approval is provided by the dean. Administrative appointments must be accompanied by an administrative SOE.

Adjustment (Reduction) to the Base Student Related Load for Grant Funded Scholarly Activities of TTT Faculty

Table 4 is premised on the mandated 60% student-related starting base. It acknowledges the work associated with proposal activity and grant funded work for the TTT faculty. The reduction in base is determined by the sum of current annual funding and proposal writing OR the level of active three year funding. In the case of proposal writing, this activity must result in a major proposal(s) that has been successfully submitted through OGCS to the appropriate funding agency. As noted above, the maximum reduction from the based student-related allocation is 20%. However, faculty may buy down their student-related load further, but those buy-down dollars must come from new funding that is not

already counted towards the reduction in the base student-related workload. The standard rate to buyout of a 3-unit course is equal to 10% of the faculty member's AY salary plus ERE.

Table 4 Reduction* in Base Student-Related Loads for Grant Funded or Proposal Writing Activity

	Current Annual Funding	Current Proposal Writing Activity (Total Value)	Active Three-Year** Funding	Reduction to Base AY Student Related Load	Net Student-Related Load from a 60% Base w/o Other Adjustments
1	\$25,000 to < \$50,000	-----	\$75,000 to <\$150,000	5%	55%
2	\$50,000 to <\$150,000	>\$150,000	\$150,000 to <\$450,000	10%	50%
3	>\$150,000	-----	>\$450,000	20%	40%

*Maximum reduction that is permitted via grant and proposal activity is 20%. Buy-down is permitted.

**Three year is defined as past year, current year, and next year; whereby current is defined as the year that the workload is being calculated for.

The implementation of the Table 4 during workload negotiations relies on the honor code, whereby each faculty member must properly report their intended writing and funding activities within the framework of Table 4. The faculty is responsible for providing an honest representation of their effort in multi-investigator and/or multi-department proposals and grants. For example, it would not be appropriate for a faculty member to claim full credit (e.g. the full funding) for a proposal in which his or her effort was limited; partial credit in terms of reduced funding level would be appropriate. All proposals and grants involving co-PIs or multiple PIs must have their effort accounted appropriately. Significant misrepresentation of grant writing and funding activities is a serious offense to the faculty code of ethical conduct.

As noted in the introductory section this policy, the unit chair or director has the authority to make allocation decisions for borderline situations.

Table 5 Example AY Workload Allocation for a TTT Faculty with Current Annual Grant Funded Activity >\$150,000

	AY Allocation	Equiv. Workload/Sem. (Units)	Equiv. Workload/AY (Units)	Equiv. Work/ Week (Hours/Days)
Student-Related Activities	40%	6	12	16 hrs or 2 days
Scholarly & Creative Activities	50%	7.5	15	20 hrs or 2.5 days
Service	10%	1.5	3	4 hrs or .5 days
Total	100%	15	30	40 hrs or 5 days

The scholarly expectations related to the 50% scholarship assignment of Table 5 include the research, management, submission, and/or dissemination work associated with the 20% of the funded activities plus three products associated to the 30%.

Various Additional Student-Related Load Definitions

The CEFNS value that our faculty members contribute to the experiences and education of our students in a variety of important ways that go beyond the standard and regular 3-unit course. In that regard, Table 6 contains the workload definitions for the various common ways that faculty contribute within

the realm of student-related responsibilities in our diverse college. These definitions are to be used by the faculty and unit administrators to develop the AY workload allocations in student-related responsibilities through an accumulation of effort. Table 6 relies on the percentage format, which systematically enables variations to the 3 units = 10% rule.

Table 6 Workload Definitions for Student-Related Activities

	Nos. Stud.	Per Unit Alloc.	e.g. 3 Units	Unit Per Stud.	Per Stud. Alloc.	Max. Alloc. Per Sem.
1. Academic/Career Advising & Student Teacher Supervision						
a. Assigned undergraduate advising load				.03	.1%	5%
b. Advisor of a student club with major activities	15					2.5%
c. Assigned non-thesis graduate advising				.06	.2%	5%
d. Supervision of student teachers	1					3.33%
	2 or 3					6.67%
	4					10%
2. Course Instruction						
a. Routine, standard, lecture		3.33%	10%			
b. Instruction-related office hours ¹						2.5%
c. Large enrolled course	>60	4.17%	12.5%			
	>120	5%	15%			
d. Grading intensive ²						
w/o grading or reading assistance		4.17%	12.5%			
w/grading or reader assistance		3.33%	10%			
e. Co-convened (counts as one course)		4.17%	12.5%			
f. New course		4.17%	12.5%			
g. Team-taught						
Tag-team		1.67%	5%			
True Team (full-time presence in class always)		2.5%	7.5%			
h. Recitation		1.67%				
i. Graduate Seminar		1.67%				
j. Course with field trips outside of regularly scheduled lab		4.17%	12.5%			
3. Laboratory⁴ Sections						
a. Totally taught by TA		0%				
b. Taught by TA, Faculty supervises TA		1.67%				
c. Faculty lead, assistance by TA or lab manager		3.33%				
d. Taught totally by faculty		6.67%				
4. Independent Study, Research, Thesis or Dissertation						
a. Underg. or grad. enrolled in minimally-supervised course experiences that may include: field work, independent study, co-op, project, paper				.1	.33%	5%
b. Underg. or grad. enrolled in supervised experience such as a research course ^{3,5}				.5	1.67%	10%
c. Committee chair for: Master-level thesis (699) or final master's project or portfolio, or PhD dissertation (799)				1	3.33%	10%
d. Active service on masters project or portfolio, thesis, or dissertation committee during semester of defense				.1	.33%	5%
e. Not enrolled in a course					0%	

¹This allocation is less than the actual number of office hours that a faculty member should be holding per week in accordance to their respective department policies. In principle, all members of the faculty are expected to hold enough office hours to adequately accommodate the needs of all of his or her students.

²Grading intensive includes a minimum of one major assignment per week with individualized feedback and multiple (more than two/semester) problem-based or writing, non-binary exams.

³The CEFNS will need to develop a policy that accommodates funded research work with credit.

⁴Laboratories are experimental-based experiences that include: designing the activities, instrumentation set-up and maintenance, material preparation, and close supervision of students.

⁵Chairs and/or unit directors are to evaluate the productivity associated with such activities (e.g. students as co-authors, presenters, etc.) and to modify work load allocations in accordance.

As noted earlier, the unit chair or director has the discretion based upon the true work associated with an activity, to interpolate and extrapolate from this table to accommodate unique and borderline situations. For example, a faculty member who has been assigned to a course that he or she taught before but not for many semesters, that course might be considered a new prep within the framework of Table 6. The extensive integration of technology for the first time might also be considered a new prep. Similarly, the chair has the authority to decide if a reduction in course load allocation is or is not appropriate in multiple section teaching assignments depending upon the nature of the course, sections, and teaching. These specifications can accumulate as well. For example, a large (>60) 3-credit course class that is homework intensive without grading assistance could be assigned a load of $10\% + (4.17\% - 3.33\%) \times 3 + (4.17\% - 3.33\%) \times 3 = 15\%$ for the AY; equating to 12 hours per week. Table 7 is one example of the many variations possible in the CEFNS of how a student-related allocation might look. It demonstrates how allocations accumulate within a course and over the AY, as well as the overall accounting methodology. This table is merely to demonstrate the calculation methodology. It is not intended to infer anything about anyone's load.

Table 7 Example AY Allocation for a TTT with a Base 60% Student Related Load

Course or Activity	Type	Credit Hours	Nos. Stud.	Semester	% Allocation
CENE 330	LEC	3	20	Fall	10%
CENE 281L	LAB/Alone	1	12	Fall	6.67%
CENE 430	LEC	3	20	Fall	10%
CENE 386W	LEC/Intensive	3	40	Spring	12.5%
CENE 435	LEC/LAB/Alone	2-1	15	Spring	13.33%
Undergrad. Advising			40	Fall	4%
Undergrad. Advising			40	Spring	4%
Instr. Office Hours				Fall & Spring	5%
Total Student Rel.					65.5%