

Faculty Workload Policy Proposal

Task Force Draft 11

March 11, 2016

Faculty Workload Task Force

Christy Drale, Chair

Brian Berry

Abhijit Bhattacharyya

Tom Clifton

Cindy Gilbert

Rebecca Glazier

Gail Hughes

Clea Hupp

Kim Jones

Anne Liebst

Beth McMillan

Robert Mitchell

Sherry Robertson

Jan Thomas

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This faculty workload policy at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock succeeds the previous policy (*UALR Faculty Instructional Load Policy*) that was instituted in 1994. The 1994 policy was based on a determination of instructional load with activities related to research/creative activity and service accounted for by reassignment of portions of the instructional load to those activities. The policy described in this document relies instead on a distribution of effort model that recognizes teaching, research/creative activity and service as the three primary components of a faculty member's workload. Each faculty member is assigned a percentage of effort for each component on an annual basis according to the needs of the institution and the professional development needs of the faculty member.

The teaching workload is quantified using instructional units. The policy attempts to capture the diversity in disciplines as well as class types in ensuring recognition of the faculty member's workload. Recognizing that contact hours in teaching are not always identical to credit hours, the policy proposes a model that makes the connection between contact hours and instructional units (IU) using IU multipliers. The policy allows flexibility in multipliers of certain course types, and provides for a college level committee to make recommendations to the dean of the college and the Provost on the multipliers of those courses. Instructional units are converted to percentage of effort for the instructional component of the total workload assignment. One three-credit hour lecture/discussion course (or 3 instructional units) is typically equivalent to 20% of effort in a semester, or 10% within a year. Percentages for the research/creative activity and service components are determined by estimating the percentage of total effort that will be spent in these areas in a given year based on the faculty member's planned activities.

The policy also articulates a process where a department chair will collaborate with the department faculty during fall and spring of an academic year to develop the workload assignment of each faculty member for the next academic year, which will then be submitted to the Dean for approval. A process is also described by which the policy itself is reviewed every five years. The remainder of the document articulates the details of the policy and includes an appendix where a limited number of examples of faculty workload assignments have been provided. The examples are not meant to be representative of all possible variations of a faculty's workload that could exist across different academic units in the university.

PREAMBLE

In order to serve the educational mission of the university and to achieve the dual objectives of excellence and accessibility, the UALR Faculty Workload Policy provides an effective framework for distributing faculty time and effort across the three areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, research and service. The policy balances consistency to ensure equitable recognition of faculty activity, with flexibility to allow the university and its individual units to anticipate and respond to changing needs. The policy supports the foundational role of teaching at UALR and is designed to ensure that assignments are consistent with resources and are sustainable over time.

FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY

Overview and Background

In 1994 the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) instituted its first faculty instructional load policy for the purpose of formalizing an equitable and efficient approach to distributing faculty responsibilities. This policy introduced the concept of instructional units and established equivalencies for common course types. It established procedures for assigning and reporting workload and set up a “banking” system for uncompensated overloads. There is much to admire in the 1994 workload policy. The structure is built on a foundation of enduring principles that remain relevant and useful. It affirms the need for balance between standardization and flexibility and makes much progress towards that end. It recognizes the importance of matching needs with resources and establishes procedures to facilitate that goal. Finally, it makes explicit the need to connect the workload assignment to both annual review and the promotion and tenure review processes. The policy even proposed a periodic review process for the policy itself.

The 1994 Faculty Instructional Load Policy served the university well for many years. However, as faculty activities and instructional modalities became more complex, it became apparent that the policy would need to be updated to address the needs of the institution. Also, many of the policy provisions and committee recommendations from the initial report were not developed such as connecting workload assignments to annual review, developing a common approach to individualized instruction, team-teaching, lab courses, and establishing a policy for teaching outside of one’s department. The Faculty Teaching Load Committee (the committee that proposed the 1994 policy) recommended that each college develop its own guidelines for equivalencies and procedures. Some colleges had this in place and some did not. Furthermore, although the policy suggested the type of oversight that should take place for maintaining equitable assignments, this oversight was not consistently applied and inequities emerged. The periodic review that was specified in the policy was not implemented after the policy was formally adopted.

The expansion of online curriculum raised the question of whether online courses would be weighted differently than their face-to-face counterparts. The promotion of interdisciplinary learning opportunities and other high impact learning activities also challenged faculty and administrators to

think about how these would be addressed with existing policy. Likewise, the increasing emphasis on community engagement and service introduced another challenge as the 1994 policy treated service as an alternative to research for reassigned time.

Given these and other concerns, the Provost appointed a task force in 2014 to review the workload issues and make a recommendation for revision of UALR's faculty workload policy. The fourteen-member task force met regularly for over a year and considered, studied, and debated a number of different models. Ultimately, the task force settled upon a hybrid approach that retains the best elements of the original policy while adding new or modified elements that are designed to address most of the issues we struggle with in the current environment.

[After this proposal is vetted and presented to the Faculty Senate; additional narrative will be added to describe that part of the process.]

General Principles

Consistent with state laws and the university mission, this policy seeks to set the parameters of faculty workload distribution among the appropriate faculty roles as described in UALR policies 403.20 and 403.23 also known as Faculty Roles and Rewards I and II.

This policy retains the purpose of the original Instructional Load Policy adopted in 1994. Specifically that the goal is to:

Distribute responsibilities among faculty in a way that most equitably and efficiently advances this tripartite mission of teaching, research or creative activity, and service. Consistent with the University's complexity and with its role as a metropolitan university committed to diversity, the policy is designed to protect and promote the multiplicity of faculty roles. The policy is designed to promote quality teaching, research or creative activity, and service. It is also designed to enable colleges and schools, departments, and individual faculty (sic) to pursue, plan for, and recognize the fact that different individuals and units will have different objectives and will make different commitments among the three faculty roles (UALR Faculty Instructional Load Policy, 1994).

This policy also retains and elaborates the goal of promoting the balance of four workload variables identified in the original workload policy: equity, diversity, instructional needs, and resources.

Equity: Fundamentally, workload distributions within departments, colleges and across the university must be fair and just. This does not mean that everyone must have identical assignments, but that everyone has an equal amount of work and responsibility over time, and that equivalent activities are given equal recognition for all faculty members.

Diversity: Diversity of talent and background is generally recognized as a hallmark of a strong faculty. A workload policy must be flexible enough to promote and utilize faculty strengths and take advantage of opportunities to advance excellence in all areas of performance. It should also

allow for diversity of assignment over time, recognizing that individuals and departments may have changing goals and objectives.

Instructional needs: As stated in the original workload policy, decisions about workload distribution “must reflect the University’s responsibility to meet instructional needs, offering quality education to students in all general education and degree programs” (UALR Faculty Instructional Load Policy, 1994). Instructional needs may also include a variety of delivery modes and schedules that serve the needs of the students, providing access as well as excellence in educational experiences.

Resources: Workload distributions must be based on realistic and sustainable levels of institutional resources.

This policy reinforces the following principles adapted from *Faculty Roles and Rewards I*:

Teaching: The UALR mission statement establishes teaching as a central value and the University expects all UALR faculty members to contribute to the teaching mission of the institution. Therefore, while some faculty members may have workload distributions that are heavier in research and/or service than others, this policy establishes a minimum expectation for teaching workload. (e.g. Pre-tenure faculty members may have a heavier research assignment in the first few years.)

Research/Creative Activity: All tenure track faculty members are expected to be active scholars in the most inclusive sense (e.g. Boyer model).

Service: As a metropolitan and community-engaged university, UALR has a greater expectation of its faculty in the area of service than other universities. This policy seeks to more formally recognize and account for activities in the area of service, including service that helps integrate university and community resources.

Research and service should not be considered something faculty members do *instead* of teaching, since all three areas of activity are important and expected. Therefore this workload model uses a distribution of effort framework instead of “reassigned time” or “release time”. It retains the concept of instructional units (IUs) for the instructional portion of workload only.

While this policy retains an institutional teaching baseline of twelve instructional units per semester, the model framework assumes a more typical distribution of nine instructional units per semester for tenure-track faculty members actively engaged in research and service.

Faculty members may request, in rare circumstances, an exception to the distribution maximums or minimums. These requests will be contingent on institutional needs and resources as well as the relative contribution of anticipated outcomes to the mission of the University.

This policy reinforces the principle that workload assignments should inform a faculty member’s performance evaluations. As stated in the 1994 Instructional Load Policy, approved assignments “will be

included as part of the annual review process as well as of the promotion and tenure process.” While the above principles make it clear that all faculty members are expected to engage in teaching and service; and all tenure-track faculty members are expected to be active scholars as well, evaluators should not disregard an emphasis in one or another category that is approved for any given period.

Model Framework

The faculty workload distribution of effort model uses a combination of percentage distributions and instructional units to describe full-time work by faculty members. Workload is distributed across the three performance categories as a percentage of all professional work within a year. Within the area of teaching, instructional units are used to measure the different types of instruction assigned to individual faculty members. (See instructional workload weights section below.)

The faculty workload framework is based on five assumptions:

1. Teaching, research/creative activity, and service are integral components of a faculty member’s annual assignment and as such should be fully recognized in the workload framework.
2. Full-time work by faculty members will include a certain percentage of time and effort in each category (for tenure-track faculty) or in at least two categories (for non-tenure-track faculty). The sum of effort in all categories equals 100%.
3. A faculty member’s full-time work may be distributed across an academic or fiscal year, but will not be banked for future years. In certain circumstances it may be necessary to extend the distribution period to two years to accommodate special projects or balance extra teaching loads. Faculty members will work with chairs to determine the most appropriate and equitable distribution plan.¹
4. For the different employment categories, there will be a typical workload distribution across the performance categories. This normative distribution covers most of the institutional needs most of the time, but may be adjusted to meet specific needs or to optimize resources in any given year.
5. One three-credit hour lecture/discussion course (or 3 instructional units) is typically equivalent to 20% of effort in a semester, or 10% within a year.

The distribution framework below presents the typical workload distributions for five faculty categories:

1) Tenure-track—9 month, 2) Tenure-track—12 month, 3) Tenure-track-12 month-Librarian, 4) Non-

¹ It is widely recognized that the banked hours system, while workable in theory, has not worked well in practice. What banking has a tendency to do is allow departments to borrow resources against a future that is not materially better off than the present. If there are not additional resources in future semesters, then the bank will fail. In other words, many faculty members *never* get an opportunity to cash in their banked IUs. Therefore, this policy proposes a more limited approach to banking resources. Chairs may distribute a faculty member’s workload across an academic or fiscal year, or if necessary as much as two years, but otherwise, the overload has to match the resources. If a chair needs a faculty member to teach an overload outside of these parameters, extra compensation must be paid to the faculty member. This encourages departments to maximize their resources through careful scheduling and enrollment analysis, and it protects faculty members from inadvertent exploitation.

tenure-track—9 months, and 5) Department chair—12 month. Faculty members with 10-month or 10.5-month appointments are usually taking on additional administrative (service) responsibilities and this should be figured into their annual workload distribution. Chairs should set these distributions according to the specifics of the faculty member’s assignment. Chairs or unit heads are responsible for verifying the level of activity in each category.

Although there is substantial variety in the service responsibilities of department chairs, this framework sets a typical teaching assignment of 6 instructional units per year in recognition of the expanded institutional responsibilities and expectations of chairs since the original workload level was set several decades ago when chairmanship of a department was considered a half-time job. The actual teaching assignment for chairs will vary based on a number of variables such as size and complexity of department, the use of administrative coordinators, research agenda, and additional administrative responsibilities. Deans are responsible for verifying the level of activity in each category for chairs. The category of department chair includes school directors.

Faculty Workload Typical Distribution

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY (9-MONTH)	
Typical Workload Distribution	
Teaching	60% (usually equivalent to 9 IUs/semester or 18 IUs/year; typically 6 IU minimum, 12 IU maximum in-load per semester, or 12 IU minimum, 24 IU maximum per year)
Research	10-30% (typically 25% minimum for pre-tenure faculty and 50% maximum for sponsored research salary buyout)
Service	10-30% (typically 15% maximum for pre-tenure faculty)

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY (12-MONTH)	
Typical Workload Distribution	
Teaching	60% (usually equivalent to 9 IUs/semester, 6 IUs/summer)
Research	10-30% (typically 25% minimum for pre-tenure faculty and 50% maximum for sponsored research salary buyout)
Service	10-30% (typically 15% maximum for pre-tenure faculty)

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY-LIBRARIAN (12-MONTH)	
Typical Workload Distribution (see Appendix B)	
Professional Practice	80% (librarianship responsibilities)
Research	10%
Service	10%

NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY (9-MONTH)	
Typical Workload Distribution	
Teaching	80% (usually equivalent to 12 IUs/semester)
Research	0%
Service	20%

DEPARTMENT CHAIR (12-MONTH)	
Typical Workload Distribution	
Teaching	20% (usually equivalent to 6 IUs/year)
Research	10% (chairs may negotiate for different percentage for research)
Service	70%

Instructional Workload Weights

The table below identifies various credit-bearing course types offered as part of the UALR curriculum. The third column further defines the course in terms of how many contact hours the course has per credit hour (in a face-to-face section). The fourth column indicates how that course is weighted in terms of a multiplier used with the credit hours for the course. The fifth column shows how many instructional units the course would be assigned if it is a 3 credit hour course. For instance, in the case of a 3 credit-hour lecture and lab combined where the course has a single course number and meets for two hours of lecture and two hours of lab, the weekly contact per credit hour is 1.33. If the multiplier of 1 is used with the credit hours (3) to determine the instructional units, the IUs will equal 3. If the multiplier 1.33 is used for the same number of credit hours (3) the result is 4 instructional units assigned to that course.

For course types that warrant flexibility in assigning weights, this model eliminates the multiplier ranges used in the previous policy and replaces them with two discrete multiplier values. This maintains flexibility while minimizing fractional workload assignments. The default value will be the lower value, but each college has the option of setting the higher value through a process of college-level review outlined in Item 1 under "Procedure" (Page 11). Every effort should be made to ensure equitable weights for course types. New course curriculum forms should include the Instructional unit information as part of the proposal.

All of the weights in this table assume there are no teaching assistants used for any particular section of the course. If a teaching assistant is used in the course, the multiplier will be no more than 1 in most circumstances. Since there is a wide variability in the way teaching assistants may be used, from

classroom set-up to grading to semi-autonomous instruction, this policy does not set a teaching assistant workload value. The department chair must account for the role of the teaching assistant in adjusting workload values for sections that have them.

Individualized instruction is weighted on a per student basis rather than a per credit hour basis assuming that the student is registered for a 3 credit-hour individual instruction course such as an internship or thesis credit. For instance, all undergraduate individualized instruction is weighted at .33 per student. If an instructor has nine students taking an internship course, he or she would be assigned 3 instructional units ($.33 \times 9 \approx 3$). For sections of individualized instruction that have more, or fewer than 3 credit-hours, the instructional weight per student should be adjusted accordingly.

Online and hybrid courses will fall into one of the course type categories in the Instructional Workload Table and will have the corresponding instructional unit value. Compensation may be provided for the quality certification of online courses in a process separate from regular workload assignment.

Team taught (interdisciplinary) courses will fall into one of the course type categories in the Instructional Workload Table and will have the corresponding instructional unit value. For purposes of assigning workloads to individual faculty members who are team teaching a course, the chair(s) with the approval of the dean(s) may assign up to the full IU value to each member of the teaching team. The assignment of instructional units in these cases should be based on the time and effort contributed of each team member.

Lab sections, whether independent or part of a lecture-lab combination are shown in the weights table with common credit hour-contact hour ratios. Some labs, however, will have different ratios not shown in the table. In these cases, departments should convert the different ratio to the appropriate multiplier and submit for review according to the procedures outlined in the procedures section of this policy. See appendix C for examples of conversion formulas.

The instructional workload weights table includes a course type labeled “unusually large classes”. Each department, with approval of the dean, and based on normative data, will establish discipline-specific norms for class sizes that are based on the instructional practices of the discipline and the needs of the students. Normative class size should not be based on the maximum occupancy of the classroom used. “Unusually large classes” are generally those that are at least twice the size of the disciplinary norm by course type and that maintain the level of individual attention to students provided in classes of standard size.

This instructional workload weights table eliminates the distinction between graduate and undergraduate courses as separate course types. All lecture/discussion/seminar courses, for instance, have the same weight assignment regardless of whether they are graduate or undergraduate courses. Graduate courses have fewer students than undergraduate courses by design. The extra work that may be required in terms of advanced material preparation and feedback is balanced by having smaller class sizes. In cases where graduate courses are as large as or larger than undergraduate courses of the same type in the same discipline, it may be categorized as an unusually large class and given a higher weight as appropriate.

Teaching Workload Weights Table for Credit Bearing Courses

Course Type	Examples/Explanation	Weekly Contact Hours per Unit of Credit	IUs per Credit Hour	IUs per 3 Credit Hours
Lecture/Discussion/Seminar	Standard class size for discipline	1	1	3
Science Laboratories-independent section	Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth Science, Engineering	2	1.33 or 2	4 or 6
Science Laboratories-independent section	Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth Science, Engineering	3	2 or 3	6 or 9
Lecture and Lab	Lecture and lab combined—(e.g. 2 hours lecture, 2 hours lab)	1.33	1 or 1.33	3 or 4
Lecture and Lab	Lecture and lab combined—6 contact hours total	2	1.33 or 2	4 or 6
Studio Courses	art, music, theatre studios	2	1.33	4
Dance Studio	Physical technique-all levels	Variable	1 or 1.33	3 or 4
Physical Activity Course	Leisure Studies	2	1 or 1.33	3 or 4
General Activity Course	Field experiences	2	1.33	4
Individual Music Lessons	Total IUs dependent on number of students; 3 contact hours (6 half-hour lessons) = 2 IUs	.5	.33	NA
Applied Music-Ensemble	Includes performance requirement; based on category	Variable	1, 2 or 3	NA
Clinical Practicum—Nursing	Nursing clinical rotations	3	3	9
Clinical Practicum—AUSP	Audiology and Speech Pathology	3	Set by UAMS	Set by UAMS
Bowen Law School courses	All courses in the Bowen Law School curriculum	1	1.5	4.5
Unusually Large Classes	Chair recommends/dean approves standard class size for discipline and course type, no teaching assistants	1	1.33	4
Practice Teaching	Faculty-student contact averages 2 hours per week per student	Variable	.375 or .67 per student*	NA
Individualized Instruction	Independent study, internships, practicums, UG honors, Donaghey Scholars thesis, UG research; limit 3 IUs/sem.	Variable	.33 per student	NA
Master level thesis or final project	Major advisor or methodologist; see parameters and limits in Individualized Instruction section below	Variable	.5 or 1 per student	NA
Doctoral Dissertation	Major advisor or methodologist; see parameters and limits in Individualized Instruction section below	Variable	.5 or 1 per student	NA
Doctoral Research/Dissertation	Major advisor of research and dissertation in Applied Science, Bioinformatics, Engineering Science & Systems, and Integrated Computing, see parameters and limits below	Variable	.5 or 1 per student	NA

* Per student multipliers generally assume that the student is registered for three credit hours, but they are not strictly tied to credit hours since the workload for these individualized teaching categories does not always match the credit hours for which the student registers.

Individualized Instruction Parameters and Limits

Individualized instruction IUs are limited to 3 IUs per instructor per semester, but may be increased to a maximum of 6 IUs in certain circumstances with approval from the dean. This includes undergraduate individualized instruction, master level thesis/final project advising, and doctoral level research and dissertation advising. When a methodologist serves as a co-advisor on a master or doctoral level project, each co-advisor will receive .5 IU for that project instead of 1 IU. Students must be enrolled in thesis, dissertation, or research/dissertation hours for instructor to receive IU credit for advising. There is a limit of three semesters per student for receiving IU credit for masters level thesis advising, a limit of six semesters per student for receiving IU credit for doctoral level dissertation advising, and a limit of eight semesters per student for receiving IU credit for doctoral research/dissertation advising in those units that combine these requirements into one course type. These courses are identified by the course title: Doctoral Research/Dissertation. Faculty members may request, in rare circumstances, an exception to the individualized instruction limits. These requests will be contingent on institutional needs and resources as well as the relative contribution of anticipated outcomes to the mission of the University.

Procedures

1. Each college and the Law School will establish college-wide credit hour multipliers for discretionary course modalities consistent with the university-wide policy. The default multiplier will be the lower value. An Interdisciplinary college committee will review proposals for the higher value. Chairs submit proposals for the higher value multiplier to the interdisciplinary college-level committee. Committee recommendations must be approved by the dean and Provost in order to be implemented. These multipliers will be reviewed within the college every five years. College/School policies must be on file in the Provost's Office.
2. Annually, department chairs, in consultation with departmental faculty members and appropriate department committees, will draw up plans for the distribution of teaching, research, and service for the next academic year. Chairs are responsible for ensuring that these plans are consistent with resources, productivity expectations, student needs, institutional goals, and faculty members' individual professional goals. Chairs will submit department plans to the deans for review and approval.
3. Each spring, department chairs will meet with departmental faculty members for the faculty member's annual review. At this meeting, the faculty member's workload distribution of teaching, research and service for the next academic year will be established. These distributions will be included as part of the annual review process as well as of the promotion and tenure process. Any assignment changes made as a result of changed circumstances (e.g. sudden shift in enrollment, illness of colleague, etc.) will be noted taken into consideration in the evaluation process.
4. Each spring, as part of the annual review process, chairs will negotiate their own workload distribution with their dean.
5. Each fall and spring, chairs will submit faculty workload reports to the college dean for review. The dean will submit workload reports to the Provost's Office for review.

Policy Review

The UALR Faculty Workload Policy will be reviewed by an ad hoc committee every five years. The Provost and Faculty Senate President will collaborate to appoint the members of this committee. The committee should have representation from each of the academic units, it should have representation from different ranks and administrative levels including chairs and associate deans, and it should have members who can speak to different types of assignments such as individualized instruction, clinical supervision, lab preparation, etc. The committee will produce a written recommendation that will be submitted to the Provost for review. Final approval of recommendations are made by the Chancellor.

Notes

1. The term “tenure-track faculty” is defined as all faculty members who are tenure-eligible. This includes both pre-tenure faculty members and those faculty members who have been granted tenure.
2. For the purposes of teaching workload weights, a course taught may include multiple sections, but still be considered one course assignment as when a course is cross-listed or has multiple levels “stacked” into one course. On the other hand, using a single online course management shell for two sections will be considered two course assignments unless the sections are intended to be combined into one course assignment, such as adding an honors component or adding an online campus component.

APPENDIX A

Examples of Faculty Load Assignments

1. Example of first-year tenure-track faculty member

First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty Member (9-month)	
Teaching	50% (15 IUs for first year)
Research	35%
Service	15%

In this example, a first-year assistant professor is teaching five courses over fall and spring, each course having a value equivalent to 3 instructional units. In an academic year time-frame, 3 IUs equals 10% of overall workload. Five courses multiplied by 10% results in a 50% workload assignment for teaching. This faculty member is devoting more time to research in the first year than the typical 20-30% of a research active faculty member. She is devoting the remainder of her time to service, not exceeding the 15% maximum for first-year faculty.

2. Example of a tenured faculty member with reduced scholarly activity

Tenured Faculty Member (9-month)	
Teaching	70% (21 IUs for the year)
Research	10%
Service	20%

In this example, a tenured faculty member will be doing some initial research preparation in the spring and a typical service workload throughout. Therefore, he will teach 12 IUs in the fall and 9 IUs in the spring for a total of 70% in teaching.

3. Example of faculty member over three years with changing emphasis

Tenured Faculty Member (9-month) over 3 Year Period			
Teaching	40% (12 IUs/year)	60% (18 IUs/year)	60% (18 IUs/year)
Research	50%	25%	15%
Service	10%	15%	25%

In this example, a faculty member has sponsored research in the first year with grant salary release, so she teaches 12 IUs for the year and scales back service to the minimum. In the second year, her grant is done, but she is still publishing from the work done on the grant. She moves to a more typical

distribution. In the third year, she has an opportunity to work on a major service project tied to her research, so she continues to teach three courses per semester, but flips the percentages between research and service.

Draft

APPENDIX B

Explanation of Workload for Library Faculty in the Division of Collections and Archives

Teaching faculty can define, with a fair amount of accuracy, their work each semester based upon a set number of credit hours taught; time for class preparation; amount of office hours required; university committee work; research; and in the case of UALR the number of SSCH produced. Consequently, teaching faculty workload is more predictable and consistent.

Library faculty work is not as easily defined. For example, only predictable pieces of the librarian's workload are reference; activities related to collections and resources; information technology; as well as teaching. Librarians cannot rely on teaching a specified number of hours a week, or project how many student consultations will occur each semester. Consequently, library faculty workload is unpredictable and inconsistent.

Members of the library faculty should have appropriate, balanced and equitable workloads based on time scheduled for all aspects of their professional responsibilities.

Establishing Workload

- A. The library faculty recommends that each faculty member's workload include a combination of 1) professional duties such as resource collection development, reference and research services, resource organization and control, information literacy initiatives and library instruction, development and evaluation of information delivery systems, monitoring and adopting new information technologies, supervision of staff, and management of library units; 2) professional development as necessary to fulfill ongoing library needs of both a maintenance and developmental nature at the university, state, national and local levels; and 3) scholarly activities, including research, writing, publication and creative artistic activities appropriate to the library faculty member's discipline or interdisciplinary work.
- B. A library faculty member on a twelve month appointment should have a defined workload requirement of 40 hours per scheduled work week with maximum latitude in weekly use of scheduled hours to allow the fulfillment of multiple responsibilities, many of which are not scheduled weekly, for example, committee work, evening and weekend duties, research and publication, professional development.

Library faculty workload policies should follow all relevant university policies. Librarians will spend approximately 10-20% of their time on a combination of service and research and scholarly communications, which will be largely self-directed. The remaining 80-90% will consist of professional practice (librarianship).

APPENDIX C

Determining Multipliers for Lab Courses Not in Weights Table

For lab course configurations not shown in the Teaching Workload Weights Table, the following examples demonstrate how to determine appropriate multipliers for these courses.

Example 1

The weight table shows that for an independent lab section that has two contact hours for every one credit hour (1:2 ratio), the multiplier default is 1.33 so that a 3 credit hour lab section would be 4 instructional units.

$$3 \text{ credit hours} \times 1.33 = 4 \text{ IUs}$$

If you have an independent lab course that has a 1:3 ratio; that is, for every one credit hour there are three contact hours, you would convert with the following equation:

$$\frac{\text{Course 1 Contact Hours}}{\text{Course 1 Multiplier}} = \frac{\text{Course 2 Contact Hours}}{X}$$

$$\frac{2}{1.33} = \frac{3}{X} \rightarrow 2X = 3 \times 1.33 \rightarrow X = \frac{3.99}{2} \rightarrow X = 1.995$$

You would probably round up 1.995 to 2 to get a multiplier of 2 for this course so that a three hour course would be six instructional units.

$$3 \text{ credit hours} \times 2 = 6 \text{ IUs}$$

If your college is using the higher value for the course that has a 1:2 ratio, then you would substitute 2 for 1.33 in the equation. This would give you a multiplier of 3 for the course with a 1:3 ratio.

Example 2

The weight table shows that for a combined lecture and lab course that has 1.33 contact hours for every one credit hour, the multiplier default is 1 so that a 3 credit hour lecture and lab section would be 3 instructional units. If you have a similar class that meets for 5 contact hours, your ratio changes from 1:1.33 to 1:1.67. Disregarding for the moment the different possible configurations between lecture and lab hours in the combined sections, you can convert the default value for the first course by using the same formula as above:

$$\frac{1.33}{1} = \frac{1.67}{X} \rightarrow 1.33X = 1 \times 1.67 \rightarrow X = \frac{1.67}{1.33} \rightarrow X = 1.25$$

So, for this 3 credit hour course, the multiplier would be 1.25 and it would have 3.75 IUs. If your college uses the higher multiplier of 1.33 for the course with 4 contact hours, you would substitute 1.33 for 1 in the equation. This would give you a multiplier of 1.67 for the course resulting in 5 IUs. The ratio of lecture to lab hours may be a contributing factor in deciding whether to use the default or higher multiplier value.