

**Planning and Finance Sub-Committee Report on the
“Pilot” Implementation of the New Faculty Load Policy**

Submitted for April 29, 2022, Faculty Senate Meeting

**Joanne Liebman Matson, Rhetoric and Writing
Lisa Sherwin, Psychology
Johni Beth Teague, Nursing**

Conclusions about the process

1. The data is not consistent and should not be relied on for decision-making until it is. For example, there are seventeen faculty listed with over 800 IUs; also, as noted below, there is no consistent definition of how IUs correlate with teaching percentage.
2. There should probably be at least another 2, even 3 terms collected and analyzed before being used for decision-making.
3. If conditions 1 and 2 are met, the report may become a useful tool for analyzing instructional resources by unit.
4. The policy states each college should have a committee made up of at least 50% faculty to make decisions about exceptions, for example, with respect to individualized instruction. These committees should be established immediately. The committees need an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the data. Moreover, case studies for exceptions should be developed so decisions can be calibrated for consistency.
5. Some units have unique teaching configurations and so the standard report may not accurately reflect their loads.
 - a. Nursing, for example, uses team-teaching, and they follow a 12-month calendar for the AAS and RN-to-BSN. Such departments should develop a description (if they have not already done so) of how to calculate load in their unit so this can be shared with all stakeholders as needed. The units should not rely on the unstated rules since leadership often changes.
 - b. Other programs that may need to develop such descriptions include programs like
 - i. Music, which has much individualized instruction;
 - ii. Art, which has much studio coursework.
 - iii. Lab sciences.

The college-level committees can be charged with reviewing these plans.

6. The “Notes” column in the report should be used to explain any non-standard teaching assignments or allocations of load.
7. The units of measurement should probably be at the departments and schools, not the colleges, since the colleges are so large and varied.

Observations of the data

1. A little over half of all faculty are assigned a 60/20/20 load. (53% at 60% teaching; 54% at 20% scholarship; and 63% at 20% service.)
2. However, what counts as a 60% load varies widely, from 3 IUs to 15 IUs. There should be some attempt to standardize the correlation between percentage and actual load.
3. Individualized instruction:
 - a. half of all faculty have no IUs for individualized instruction.
 - b. Twenty percent have 3 IUs listed (under the new policy) but report more than 3 actual individualized instruction under the old policy.
 - c. Seven percent list more than 3 IUs in the new policy, ranging up to a high of 390 individualized IUs.
 - d. It’s not known if such numbers are accurate. There may definitely be units where the cap of 3 individualized IUs is unfair to the faculty member. On the other hand, the excess of individualized instruction may signal a unit has shifted too much classroom instruction to individualized instruction.
 - e. The college committees, once established, will be best positioned to make recommendations for exceptions.
4. Pedagogical IUs range from 0 to 1190, with numerous faculty assigned some fraction of an IU. The report doesn’t explain how these numbers are derived. To be useful, the report should indicate what multipliers have been used to generate these IUs.
5. Pedagogical IUs do cluster around 3, 6, 9, and 12 IUs, with 9 being the most common.
6. Chair and director loads vary widely, from 0 to 15 total IUs. The mean chair load is 8.6, and the median is 4.7. There may be valid reasons for the variation based on the department or on the Chair’s other commitments and responsibilities; however, this needs to be stated explicitly.