

2004

Faculty Roles and Rewards: Recommendations on a Faculty Effort Assignment Model

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "Faculty Roles and Rewards: Recommendations on a Faculty Effort Assignment Model" (2004). *Faculty Senate Index*. 279.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/279>

This other is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

DRAFT

**Faculty Roles and Rewards:
Recommendations on a Faculty Effort Assignment Model
for Georgia Southern University**

Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards

Denise Battles, Task Force Chair

Cheryl Aasheim, College of Information Technology

Bryan Griffin, College of Education

Kyle Hancock, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

Mary Hazeldine, College of Business Administration

Barry Joyner, College of Health and Human Sciences

Broderick Oluyede, College of Science and Technology

Charles Skewis, Henderson Library

Deborah Thomas, Faculty Senate

Candace Griffith, Resource & Support

September 2004 ~~April 2004~~

Executive Summary

The Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards was charged with: 1) characterizing current faculty roles at Georgia Southern University, 2) identifying any disconnections in the institution's roles and rewards systems, and 3) recommending a model for faculty effort assignment that addresses any disconnections, aligns with the existing reward system, and supports faculty professionalism. Earlier reports address the first two components of the task force's charge. This document builds on those reports, provides relevant background information, and outlines the task force's recommended faculty effort assignment model.

The recommendations within the model are:

1. Establish a flexible faculty assignment system, with individualization of each faculty member's assignment in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and, if applicable, administration. [page 5]
2. Utilize a decentralized approach that allows for the development of college/library and unit models that are more specific than (but still consistent with) the broad institutional framework. Each college and unit will submit its proposed approach to the next administrative level for review and approval. [page 6]
3. Establish the academic unit as the primary locus of workload determination, with a process that includes consultation of the faculty member, assignment by the unit head, and approval of the dean. [page 6]
4. Balance each faculty member's workload interests with the workload needs of his/her academic unit, with the unit head playing a key role in attaining this balance. [pages 5-6]
5. Assign faculty workload based on the concept of the "workload hour," defined as the number of hours, based upon Georgia Southern's hypothetical full faculty load of 15 hours per semester, to which a given teaching, scholarly, service, and/or administrative activity is deemed equivalent. [page 4]
6. Establish workload hour ranges for the areas of teaching (9 to 12 hours), scholarship (1 to 5 hours) and service (1 to 5 hours) within the 15 hour total workload per semester, and institute a mechanism for accommodating administrative assignments and/or exceptional cases. [pages 7-8, 11]
7. Create annually for each faculty member a workload agreement, to be developed by the faculty member and his/her unit head at the annual faculty review meeting. The workload agreement will specify the individual's effort distribution in each area, goals for each area and, as appropriate, the time frames and documentation necessary for demonstrating achievement of the goals. Each annual faculty review meeting will consider and evaluate performance on the preceding year's goals. Workload agreements will be submitted to and reviewed by the dean. [pages 7-9]

8. Link workload assignment and faculty evaluation processes and provide for the faculty member's active participation in both sets of processes. [page 9]
9. Institute a flexible faculty evaluation system that utilizes weighting percentages that are consistent with institutional values and the actual distribution of time spent by faculty members in the three areas of activity: teaching (40-80%), scholarship (10-40%), and service (10-40%). The colleges and/or units may choose to further narrow the ranges and will develop the specific manner in which they will employ the evaluation percentages so they are aligned with their own missions and priorities. [pages 10-11]
10. Identify annually for each faculty member the evaluation percentages to be applied in the coming year. The percentages will be identified at the annual faculty review meeting with the faculty member's input, and with the opportunity for changes to be made as the year progresses, subject to the unit head's approval. [pages 11-12]
11. Have or develop in each college and unit a mechanism for "mapping" its current evaluation system to one in which percentages can be applied for the purposes of faculty evaluation and also for merit salary increase determinations. [page 12]
12. Incorporate into evaluation materials an individual's effort assignments for the period under review to ensure that the faculty member's effort distribution is available for consideration during the evaluation process. [page 14]
13. Establish a model development and implementation process that includes the participation of all of Academic Affairs' administrative levels (faculty, unit heads, deans, and Provost) and provides for both campus-wide equity and accountability. [pages 13-14]
14. Utilize the Faculty Effort Allocation form as a means of reporting faculty and unit effort. [pages 13-14]
15. Revisit the workload hour and evaluation ranges as the institution's mission and priorities continue to evolve. [page 10]

~~Key elements of the model are:~~

- ~~• Flexibility in faculty assignments, allowing for individualization of each faculty member's assignment in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and, if applicable, administration.~~
- ~~• A decentralized approach, offering the colleges/library and academic units the opportunity to develop their own detailed models consistent with the broad institutional framework, and establishing the academic unit as the primary locus of workload determination.~~
- ~~• A system of balancing each faculty member's workload interests with the workload needs of his/her academic unit.~~

- ~~Assignment of faculty workload based on the concept of the “workload hour,” defined as the number of hours, based upon Georgia Southern’s hypothetical full faculty load of 15 hours per semester, to which a given teaching, scholarly, service, and/or administrative activity is deemed equivalent. The workload hour provides a common basis for faculty workload that acknowledges and accommodates distinct disciplinary cultures and practices.~~
- ~~Establishment of workload hour ranges for the areas of teaching (9 to 12 hours), scholarship (1 to 5 hours) and service (1 to 5 hours) within the 15 hour total workload per semester, with a mechanism for accommodating administrative assignments and/or exceptional cases.~~
- ~~A mechanism for linking workload assignment and faculty evaluation processes and a provision for the faculty member’s active participation in both sets of processes.~~
- ~~Flexibility in faculty evaluation, with a system that utilizes weighting percentages that are consistent with institutional values and the actual distribution of time spent by faculty members in the three areas of activity: teaching (40-80%), scholarship (10-40%), and service (10-40%).~~
- ~~A model development and implementation process that includes the participation of all of Academic Affairs’ administrative levels (faculty, unit heads, deans, and Provost) and provides for both campus-wide equity and accountability.~~

Introduction

The Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards was established by Georgia Southern University Provost Vaughn Vandegrift in response to faculty interest in evaluation, faculty assignments and distribution of effort, and the reward system. In fall 2002, the task force received its charge, which included:

1. Compiling a summary of current faculty roles through conducting a faculty assignment survey. Such a summary should address the following questions: What is the current distribution of faculty effort among the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and/or administrative duties? How does that distribution correspond with other standards for faculty workload? What are the processes by which faculty effort assignments are determined (how, when, and by whom)?
2. Identifying any disconnections between current faculty activities and those activities that faculty desire and/or need to pursue in order to be professionally successful.
3. Studying and recommending a model(s) for faculty effort assignment that will address any disconnections identified in #2, align with the institutional reward structure, and better support faculty professionalism. Such a model should be consistent with and reflect Georgia Southern's mission and priorities, as well as the strategic plan.

Data collection activities addressing the first two components of the charge were undertaken in 2002 and 2003, resulting in two reports which are available on the task force's website, <<http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/frr/>>. The first of these is a compilation of college- and unit-level formal faculty load policies at Georgia Southern. It includes information on program accreditations that may constrain faculty load. The second provides a summary of current faculty roles, faculty effort assignment processes, and attitudes and perceptions about the institution's roles and rewards systems. The current document builds on the earlier reports and addresses the final component of the task force's charge, providing recommendations for an institutional faculty effort assignment model.

Background and Methods

Georgia Southern University has undergone a series of substantive changes in recent years. In keeping with the attainment of regional university status in 1990, Georgia Southern, and the roles of its faculty, has become increasingly complex. The institution has always had a commitment to quality teaching, but like many comprehensive institutions that have evolved from "normal schools," expectations for faculty engagement in scholarship and service have risen, and the distribution of faculty effort has changed. The Faculty Roles and Rewards initiative was undertaken to describe faculty roles as they currently exist at Georgia Southern, in order to recommend ways of better aligning faculty assignments with the institution's reward structure and to more effectively support faculty professionalism.

The task force's data collection provided information on faculty activities and effort distribution among the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and administration¹ (see <http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/frr/pass/dataresults.html>) and indicated a number of disconnections and/or needs. For example, the faculty effort distribution reported by faculty members is quite different than that reported by their unit heads, suggesting a disconnection

between assignment of workload and actual effort expenditure. It was also established that faculty effort assignment processes, and the linkages between effort assignment and faculty evaluation, display variability across campus. A key disconnection involves the relationship between teaching and scholarship. Faculty and administrators recognize scholarly activity as highly valued at Georgia Southern, and many faculty wish to do more scholarly and creative activities and professional development. However, they and their unit heads indicate that the institution's teaching load poses a major barrier to increased engagement in these areas. The articulation between our faculty roles and rewards systems also appears problematic; less than 30% of responding unit heads - those who play a key part in determining faculty merit recommendations - agree that expectations for faculty merit increases are clear. These results highlight the need for the campus to develop and implement a model for faculty effort assignment that clearly aligns with the campus' reward system.

Essential to any recommendation on a model for faculty effort assignment is an understanding of existing policies that govern faculty workload at Georgia Southern. The task force gathered and reviewed such policies and documents. Key among these:

University System of Georgia

As a member institution of the University System of Georgia (USG), Georgia Southern is subject to system-level faculty workload policies. The Board of Regents (BOR) Policy Manual circa 1993 specified that the "...normal teaching load of a faculty member of the University System of Georgia ordinarily shall be fifteen quarter credit hours per week." However, that language was subsequently dropped and the current view is that faculty teaching loads and workloads fall within the purview of the institutions rather than the BOR (see System Perspectives on Faculty Teaching Load / Work Load, posted on the USG's website at <http://www.usg.edu/admin/comm/acaddocs/workteachload.phtml>). Regardless, it is Georgia Southern's longstanding culture to talk about a full faculty load of 15 hours per semester.

Georgia Southern University

Several Georgia Southern documents address the issue of faculty workload. The *Faculty Handbook* identifies the standard teaching load for full-time faculty as 12 credit hours per semester. The university's letter of offer for tenure-track faculty positions specifies a normal workload per semester of "the equivalent of twelve semester hours of teaching and other assignments as determined by the department chair / school director / school chair." A July 1998 memo from Acting Provost Linda Bleicken on "Semester System Employment Issues" describes the way in which teaching load relates to a complete workload for a nine-month (0.750 EFT) faculty member:

"A full academic year at 0.750 EFT is based on the hypothetical full load of 15 hours per semester. Our standard 12-hour load reflects the non-teaching duties of our full-time faculty."

The full load of 15 hours per semester is based on the equivalence of 0.025 EFT per course credit hour, a relationship that was established for USG institutions at the time of semester conversion. If one semester credit hour constitutes 0.025 EFT, then the workload for a full-time nine-month faculty member is equivalent to 30 credit hours per academic year, or 15 hours per semester:
 $(0.025 \text{ EFT} / 1 \text{ credit hour}) = (0.750 \text{ EFT} / 30 \text{ credit hours}) = (0.375 / 15 \text{ credit hours})$

Colleges and Units of Georgia Southern University²

A number of formal faculty load policies exist in Georgia Southern's colleges, departments, and schools. Because the task force is a university-level committee, these policies do not constrain its recommendations. However, the task force elected to compile and examine this information to gain a sense of existing campus practices and to identify any desirable models or model attributes. This research led to the task force's first report (referenced above) and informed the recommendations listed in this document.

In addition to reviewing policies and documents pertaining to faculty workload at Georgia Southern, task force members read a series of books and articles on faculty roles and rewards. Among these were Ernest Boyer's book, "*Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*," Glassick et al.'s companion work, "*Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*," chapters from McMillin and Berberet's "*A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions*," the Sid W. Richardson Foundation report, "*Restructuring the University Reward System*," and the AAUP's "*Statement on Faculty Workload with Interpretive Comments*." These references provided the foundation for the task force's subsequent study of workload models from institutions or academic units beyond Georgia Southern. Among the several dozen examined by task force members were models from Georgia Southern's peer and aspirational institutions, as well as others representing a broad range of institutional types.

Parameters for Model Identification

There are a number of constraints on a faculty effort assignment system, and it is important that a recommended model work within them. The task force members developed the following list of parameters for model development in conversation with Provost Vandegrift.

1. Maintenance of institutional student credit hour production

Because Georgia Southern is funded through a formula driven by the number of generated student credit hours (SCHs), the model must maintain institutional SCH production so that our state funding is not negatively impacted.

2. Cost-neutrality

The university is currently experiencing budget cuts to its state allocation and anticipates additional reductions in the coming year. A primary funding source for the reductions in Academic Affairs has been salary savings associated with unfilled faculty lines. Given the budgetary realities, the recommended model must be cost-neutral and cannot require the creation of new faculty lines.

3. Adherence to institutional workload standards

Any model must conform to the total 15 hour workload for full-time faculty, in keeping with our stated standard. In addition, the model must acknowledge the standard full-time teaching load of 12 credit hours, but may permit reassignments among the areas of activity (teaching, scholarship, service, and/or administration), as long as a total 15 hour workload is maintained. As a general rule, where an individual has administrative responsibilities, the

three hour assignment to the combined areas of scholarship and service should be preserved, with reassignments made from the area of teaching.

4. **Annual expectations for faculty activity in teaching, scholarship, and service**

All regular³ Georgia Southern faculty are annually evaluated in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. For that reason, it is important that any model incorporate the expectation for annual engagement of regular faculty members in these three areas and that the assignment in each area not be so small as to be negligible. At the same time, the model should make allowances for truly exceptional circumstances. For example, a model should accommodate the distinctive responsibilities of a faculty member who holds an endowed chair, or one who works for a year at an off-campus government agency on an Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) Agreement.

5. **Accommodation of disciplinary differences and accreditation requirements**

Georgia Southern's academic units span a breadth of disciplines and a faculty assignment that is acceptable for one discipline – teaching a class of 120 students in World History, for instance – can be wholly inappropriate for another, such as Composition I. As well, a number of Georgia Southern's programs hold accreditations from bodies that constrain faculty workload (see http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/fr/pass/unit_workload1x.pdf), and such accreditations should not be jeopardized by an unsuitable faculty workload model. In recognition of the importance of disciplinary differences, the task force developed the concept of the “workload hour,” defined as the number of hours, based upon Georgia Southern's hypothetical full faculty load of 15 hours per semester, to which a given teaching, scholarly, service, and/or administrative activity is deemed equivalent. *The workload hour is not a clock hour; rather it is a term used to refer to a unit of work. Thus it is not a measure of actual hours of time on task.* Using the workload hour ~~this~~ approach, the total workload hours for a full-time faculty member should equal 15 hours per semester, barring an unusual circumstance such as an overload. The workload hour concept permits those closest to a particular professional activity – generally, those in the discipline – to determine load equivalencies. For example, a 4 credit hour clinical course with an average of 16 contact hours per week might constitute 6 workload hours for a nursing faculty member, while a 3 credit hour, 5 contact hour studio course could comprise 4 workload hours for an art faculty member. The task force utilized the workload hour concept in its unit-level data collection efforts, where it proved to be a very useful and flexible tool. The task force believes that the workload hour concept is an essential component of the faculty effort assignment model.

6. **Acknowledgement of the distinct roles of temporary faculty members**

Georgia Southern's faculty includes full-time temporary individuals whose work assignment may vary from one department to another or from one individual to the next, depending on the unit's needs. For example, some temporary faculty members have assignments that are exclusively in the area of teaching, while others may encompass scholarship and/or service. In all cases, it is essential that the total workload of a full-time temporary faculty member sum to 15 workload hours per semester regardless of the specific area assignments. The recommendations for a flexible faculty effort assignment model that are made in this document pertain to full-time regular³ faculty rather than temporary faculty.

Guiding Principles for Model Identification

Along with the parameters, the task force's research identified a series of best practices or ideals for faculty effort assignment systems. The guiding principles for model development are outlined below.

1. **Equity**

A faculty effort assignment model should promote equity and it is essential that the model be as fair, reasonable, impartial, and evenly applied as possible. It is important to note that equity does not imply *sameness* of work assignments; a model could and should embrace a variety of faculty activities and distributions of effort that reflect the diversity of individual interests and talents. Equity is promoted when that variability of faculty work is recognized by the institution's reward system.

2. **Flexibility**

Flexibility in assignments is a recurring theme throughout the literature on faculty roles and rewards. It is a central component of Ernest Boyer's work, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, which noted that a faculty member's interests and professional foci are likely to change across his or her academic career. Knefelkamp (1990) wrote of the "seasons" of the academic career, citing the differences, for example, between the emphases of a novice faculty member and those of an individual who is further along in his or her career. A system of effort allocation should acknowledge such long-term shifts. It should also recognize the individuality of faculty members, each of whom has his or her own professional interests and talents. One faculty member, for instance, may have a particular aptitude for university-level service activities and seek out major leadership roles on campus, electing to emphasize service over scholarship. Another faculty member with interests in the scholarship of application may apply his or her disciplinary expertise to solving local environmental problems, putting greater effort in the area of scholarship and less in service. As noted above, it is important that all regular Georgia Southern faculty contribute to our tripartite mission of teaching, scholarship, and service, but both faculty and their units will benefit from customizing the distribution of individual responsibilities to achieve the goals of the broader unit. Finally, a model should also be flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances and unforeseen opportunities. It makes sense to design a system that supports a mid-year reassignment that permits a faculty member to take on a major editorship, for example.

3. **Responsiveness to the workload needs of the academic unit**

Much like our faculty, each academic unit at Georgia Southern is expected to make annual contributions to the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. While the levels of expected contributions may be difficult to quantify, it is clear that all units must do enough teaching to address demand and engage in scholarship and service at levels sufficient to support their own mission and those of their college and university. For a system of flexible faculty roles to be successfully implemented, it is necessary to balance the desires of individual faculty with the overall expectations and obligations of the collective unit. For example, if all of a particular department's faculty members wished to opt out of service or to perform service at

a minimal level, then the unit would be unable to make adequate contributions to this area. In many flexible workload models, the unit head (chair or director) has primary responsibility for reconciling the workload preferences of individuals with the expectations and obligations of the department or school. This can be accomplished through a periodic meeting between the unit head and each faculty member in which the workload distribution for the coming period is determined. The task force recommends this discussion occur as part of the annual faculty review meeting.

4. **Decentralization**

Several workload models investigated by the task force utilize university-level or even system-level guidelines and formulae to govern faculty workload. In deference to the disciplinary variability and complexity of Georgia Southern, the task force does not recommend the adoption of such a model. Instead, we advocate a process in which the colleges and units participate in developing their specific approach to faculty workload which is appropriate to their own missions and disciplines and is consistent with the broad framework that we propose the university adopt. The task force has compiled a listing of activities that colleges and units may wish to consider in establishing guidelines and/or formulae (Appendix 1). To facilitate equity, we also recommend a system in which each college and unit submits their proposed approach to the next administrative level for review. Along with this decentralized approach to model development, we endorse a similarly decentralized process to workload determination. As noted above, those nearest a particular activity – generally, those in the discipline - are often best able to determine the amount of effort associated with a given activity. We recommend that the unit be the primary locus of workload determination, with a process that includes consultation of the faculty member, assignment by the unit head, and approval of the dean.

5. **Linkage of workload assignment and evaluation processes**

In order that the faculty effort model align with the institution's reward structure, workload assignment and evaluation processes need to be linked. In a flexible effort assignment model, the effort distribution of one faculty member may differ significantly from that of another, and it is essential that evaluation be similarly customized, such that each person is evaluated according to his or her workload profile. An extreme example helps to illustrate the point. Faculty member Jones has a three-year research grant which permits her to buy out nine hours/semester of her teaching for the entire period of the grant. This results in a workload distribution of 3 workload hours of teaching, 11 hours of scholarship, and 1 hour of service. Faculty member Smith, a member of the same department, has a more traditional workload for this same time period consisting of 12 workload hours of teaching, 1 hour of scholarship, and 2 hours of service. Over the three-year period, Jones' and Smith's scholarly output is identical. For simplicity, let's say that both produce one peer-reviewed publication of similar caliber each year. When evaluated relative to their distinct effort distributions, Smith's scholarly productivity may be judged "excellent," in keeping with his modest assignment in that area, whereas Jones' productivity may be deemed to be only "fair" and inconsistent with her heavy scholarly assignment. In this way, the two individuals would garner different amounts of merit for their similar scholarly efforts, in keeping with their distinct work profiles.

6. **Accountability tied to productivity/outcomes/activities**

Accountability is an essential component in a flexible workload model. Every faculty member should expect to demonstrate performance consistent with his or her particular workload distribution. Reassignments from the standard effort profile (12 workload hours of teaching, and a total of 3 in the combined areas of scholarship and service) should be based on the actual effort associated with specific tasks, activities, and expectations. Decisions about future reassignments should be tied to the individual's past performance while reassigned. The task force proposes that the annual faculty review incorporate an accountability mechanism so faculty effort assignment and evaluation are clearly linked. We recommend that goal-setting appropriate to the agreed-upon effort profile be a part of the process, and that each annual faculty review meeting consider and evaluate performance on the preceding year's goals.

7. **Consistency with Georgia Southern's mission, priorities, and strategic plan**

As per our charge, the task force's recommended model for faculty effort assignment should be consistent with the university's mission, priorities, and strategic plan. Georgia Southern is currently in the process of revising its mission statement. Both the draft statement and the Level I Strategic Plan acknowledge the university's tripartite mission in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, noting the primacy of teaching and affirming the teacher-scholar model. One of the action steps in the university's Strategic Plan calls for rewarding excellence in each of the three areas, and the document also acknowledges the role of shared governance at Georgia Southern. The task force believes that its recommendations for a flexible workload policy are in keeping with the draft mission and strategic plan, and that the proposed process, which will involve the active participation of the colleges and schools, is consonant with a shared governance philosophy.

Faculty Workload

"The richness of faculty talent should be celebrated, not restricted. Only as the distinctiveness of each professor is affirmed will the potential of scholarship be fully realized." Boyer, 1990

The 15-hour workload is composed of teaching, scholarship, and service, and for some, administrative duties. The distribution of **academic year** workload for full-time regular faculty shall follow the principles outlined below:

1. **Teaching**

With a standard teaching load of 12 hours, the bulk of full-time faculty effort shall be centered on teaching. However, workload hours may be reassigned to other areas resulting in a teaching load as low as 9 hours. Some factors that might result in an adjustment to the teaching load from 12 hours are given in Appendix 1. Although rare, a teaching load below 9 workload hours is possible, but contingent upon unusual circumstances such as funding through external grants. Overload assignments agreed to by faculty shall be made according to Section 216.08 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

2. **Scholarship**

While primarily teaching focused, Georgia Southern is also keenly interested in advancing the teacher-scholar model. Research that enhances teaching is highly valued and therefore Georgia Southern expects its regular faculty to engage in scholarly pursuits. In the standard workload configuration, 12 hours are to be dedicated to teaching activities, with the balance distributed between scholarship and service. As noted above, it is possible for workload hours in teaching to be reassigned to scholarship, and such reassignment should produce results commensurate to the amount of reassignment in a timely manner. In general no less than 1 hour and no more than 5 hours, within the 15-hour workload, should be dedicated to scholarly activities. Under rare circumstances the range of hours noted here may be expanded.

3. **Service**

Faculty participation in university, college, and departmental governance and service activities is important and necessary to the proper functioning of Georgia Southern University, and to fulfill Georgia Southern's mission as a regional university. Full-time regular faculty members are expected to engage actively in service-related functions. As noted above with scholarship, no less than 1 hour and no more than 5 hours, within the 15-hour workload, should be dedicated to service activities.

4. **Administration**

The workload range for teaching will be adjusted for faculty serving in administrative roles. These include formal administrative positions such as dean, director, or department chair, as well as roles such as program coordinator, lab coordinator, undergraduate or graduate coordinator, or assistant department chair. For full-time faculty assuming administrative activities, workload adjustments/reassignments will be determined by one's unit head or dean. In general, reassignments for administrative duties should come from the area of teaching so assignments to scholarship and service are preserved.

5. **Exceptional Circumstances and Special Cases**

Georgia Southern's faculty includes individuals with job descriptions that are unusual in their effort distribution. For example, the duties of a faculty member who holds an endowed professorship may consist largely of scholarship, whereas those of a clinical faculty member might consist of teaching and service. Circumstances may also arise which result in an unusual effort distribution for a specific period of time. Examples might include the award of a major grant that results in a "buyout" of some or all of a faculty member's teaching; participation in an extended off-campus professional development activity, such as through an Educational Leave or a fellowship program; and work for a government agency through an IPA agreement. Nothing in this recommendation is intended to restrict such roles or activities. However, in these exceptional cases it is important that the faculty member, unit head, and dean identify a workload distribution and evaluation plan appropriate to the specific situation.

6. **The Workload Agreement**

A faculty member's assignment will be specified in a workload agreement. Each year at the annual faculty review meeting, a faculty member and his or her unit head will develop his or

her workload agreement for the coming year. The workload agreement will include the faculty member's effort distribution in each area, goals for each area and, as appropriate, the time frames and documentation necessary for demonstrating achievement of the goals. The agreement will be based on the unit's procedures, the needs and interests of the faculty member, the needs of the unit, and an acceptable level of effort in each area. While teaching load and workload assignments at Georgia Southern ultimately are made by the unit head, the workload agreement should reflect a conversation between the faculty member and his or her unit head. Because the ranges for each area are fairly broad, caution should be used in establishing an individual's effort distribution. Identifying the minimum or maximum number of workload hours in a particular area for an extended period of time may not be in a faculty member's best interest. Faculty need to be aware of the expectations for promotion, tenure, and other periodic evaluations, and unit heads should provide mentoring that is appropriate to each individual's case. In no case should a faculty member's workload agreement(s) be interpreted as superseding a unit's criteria for adequate performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. For example, a workload agreement that specifies a modest assignment in scholarship would not relieve an individual of meeting the basic scholarly expectations for tenure or promotion required by that unit for its faculty. Once developed, the workload agreements will be submitted to and reviewed by the dean to ensure that college needs are being met and that there is equity among the agreements within the college.

Evaluation

“What we propose, in short, is that faculty expectations and related evaluation not only be *broadened* but that they be *individualized* and *continuous* as well. If faculty are to build on their strengths and contribute constructively to the institutions where they work, evaluation criteria must be tailored to personal talents, as well as campus needs. And it is especially important, we believe, that the criteria used reflect changing patterns of personal and professional growth across a lifetime. Once again, *diversity*, not uniformity, is the key.” Boyer, 1990

At Georgia Southern University, faculty evaluations for regular faculty occur in two formats: (1) annual evaluations used to inform decisions on merit salary increases and reappointment of probationary faculty; and (2) special evaluations which are conducted to inform promotion, tenure, evaluations of continuing probationary faculty conducted each year during the probationary period, pre-tenure review, and post-tenure review.⁴ To maintain the principle of equity across colleges and ensure accountability in the implementation of the proposed workload model, it is critical to link the assignment of workload to the evaluation process. This connection is achieved through applying the faculty member's workload agreement to the evaluative mechanism.

One possible approach to evaluation might be to utilize the weights implied by a faculty member's effort distribution as outlined in the workload agreement. For example, a faculty member with a workload assignment of 12-credit hours of teaching per semester out of the 15-hour total workload would have an 80% (12/15) weight placed on the area of teaching. While such an approach may seem appealing, the task force recommends a more flexible model in which the effort distribution (as outlined in the workload agreement) may be somewhat

decoupled from the evaluative weight applied to that effort. This decoupling of effort distribution from the evaluative percentage supports the University's articulation of the role of the teacher/scholar at Georgia Southern. Equating evaluative percentages directly with effort distribution would suggest (as seen in the above example) an evaluative percentage of 80% for teaching in a standard workload distribution. This weighting leaves little room for the consideration of scholarship/creative activities, which the task force's data-collection has shown are highly valued for faculty advancement, and does not accurately reflect what actually occurs in the daily activities of faculty members (see <http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/fr/pass/dataresults.html>).

Identifying evaluation percentages differently from workload assignment promotes equity, while not constraining accountability, accommodates disciplinary differences and accreditation standards, and enhances flexibility. There may be situations when it is desirable to grant a time period greater than the normal one year for the evaluation of actual productivity achieved as a direct result of assigned effort. Such a situation might arise in the area of scholarship/creative activities, where scholarship is viewed as an effort that results in a peer-reviewed or juried work. For example, a faculty member begins the process of writing a scholarly book and develops with his department chair a workload agreement for the first year of the project that assigns 4 of his 15 workload hours to scholarship/creative activities. The faculty member puts forth significant effort in researching and developing the book, but three years' intensive labor is required before publication is achieved. This individual has a workload assignment that is heavily directed toward scholarship in year one of the project, but might request a modest 20% weight in scholarship for evaluation purposes, requesting a higher percentage when the book is in press. Such a faculty member would be expected to document satisfactory progress at his or her annual evaluation, and subsequent workload assignments would be dependent on continuing satisfactory performance. It is also important that the time frames and indicators of satisfactory progress be determined at the unit level and clearly documented so they are known to the faculty member, unit head, and dean.

Table 1 delineates the minimum and maximum permissible ranges for both workload assignments and evaluation processes that are advocated by the task force. [Both sets of ranges reflect the institution's current mission and priorities, and as the mission and priorities continue to evolve, we recommend that the ranges be revisited.](#) The evaluation percentages are broad ranges which are intended to cover a wide variety of situations and faculty assignments on the Georgia Southern campus. The task force does not expect that all colleges and units will elect to utilize the full ranges identified here, but may choose to establish their own ranges or mechanisms for applying the full ranges, as long as they are consistent with the University framework. Deviations from these minimums/maximums in individual cases would require approval by the Provost.

Table 1

	Workload ranges in hours*	Evaluation ranges in percentages
Teaching	9-12 hours	40-80%
Scholarship	1-5 hours	10-40%
Service	1-5 hours	10-40%
TOTAL	15 hours	100%

* Excludes any overload assignments agreed to by the faculty member

The task force recommends that the colleges and/or units develop the specific manner in which they will employ the evaluation percentages so they are aligned with their own missions and priorities, [while still consistent with the University's broad framework](#). Some possible approaches are given here for consideration:

1. A college with a heavy emphasis on scholarly accomplishment establishes the following evaluative ranges: teaching 40-60%, scholarship 20-40%, and service 10-30%. Each faculty member selects his or her evaluation percentages each year, and these weights are used by the unit head in the evaluation.
2. A college with a wide diversity of faculty roles elects to make available the full range of evaluation weights, and allows the faculty member to select his or her evaluation percentages within a portion of that range. With the unit head's approval, the faculty member can select from the full range. An example is shown in Table 2:

Table 2

	Evaluation ranges available at faculty member's option	Evaluation ranges available with unit head's approval
Teaching	50-70%	40-80%
Scholarship	20-40%	10-40%
Service	10-30%	10-40%
TOTAL	100%	100%

3. A college utilizes the full range of evaluation percentages but puts into place guidelines that identify the evaluation percentages available to a faculty member with a particular effort distribution. For example, a faculty member who has a one-course reassignment from teaching in order to enable a 5 workload hour assignment in scholarship might be disallowed from selecting an 80% weight in teaching and a 10% weight in scholarship.

Regardless of the specific process developed by a college and/or unit, the task force endorses a mechanism for faculty input into the evaluation percentages against which she or he will be evaluated in a given year. Such an approach allows the faculty member to be an active participant in the evaluation process. The task force also recommends that evaluation

percentages be identified during the annual faculty review meeting, with the opportunity for changes to be made as the year progresses, subject to the unit head’s approval.

The application of percentages to the evaluation process implies that the process will include a quantitative element. The task force recognizes the presence of cultural differences among the disciplines and units on campus and appreciates that such differences are reflected in the variety of evaluation methods currently employed, with some units utilizing qualitative approaches and others employing quantitative ones. In deference to such disciplinary distinctions, we do not call for wholesale revision of existing evaluation practices. However, we recommend that all colleges and units possess or develop a mechanism for “mapping” their current system to one in which percentages can be applied for the purposes of faculty evaluation and also for merit salary increase determinations. It is the task force’s hope that such an element will make the evaluation and merit determination processes more transparent and will address the serious evaluation-related disconnections that were identified in our data-collection effort.

Two examples of how evaluation might be carried out, using a quantitative system presently in operation on campus, are shown in Tables 3 and 4. The task force is not recommending this college’s system above others, but rather offers it as one possible approach. Under this system, a college establishes weights for teaching, scholarship, and service respectively (e.g., 1 to 5). A “5” in teaching would symbolize that the faculty member is considered to be one of the best teachers in that unit—highly imaginative, completely dependable, and in command of the discipline, etc. This weighting would then be applied to the evaluative percentage previously selected **by the faculty member**. For instance, a faculty member who **has selects** an evaluative measure of 60% in teaching and is rated 4.5 by the department chair for his or her effort would receive an overall rating of 2.7 in the teaching area, e.g., $0.60 \times 4.5 = 2.70$.

Table 3 – Evaluation of a faculty member

	Faculty member’s evaluation selected %	Unit head’s evaluation (1-5)	Rating in area (% X evaluation)
Teaching	60%	4.5	2.7
Scholarship	25%	4	1.0
Service	15%	4	0.6
OVERALL RATING			4.3

Table 4 – *Evaluation of an administrative faculty member, such as a department chair*

	Faculty member's evaluation selected %	Supervisor's evaluation (1-5)	Rating in area (% X evaluation)
Administration	70%	4	2.8
Teaching	10%	5	0.5
Scholarship	10%	3	0.3
Service	10%	4	0.4
OVERALL RATING			4.0

Process

All academic levels need to be involved in the implementation of the university workload policy. The Provost will oversee implementation of the process to ensure equity across the university while maintaining flexibility to meet the needs of each college and individual faculty. Because no new resources are available to implement the process, units and colleges need to make sure that student credit hour production is not adversely affected.

Each college will develop a workload model consistent with the university policy. Each dean will be responsible for initiating and directing the development of the college model. The model-development process should be designed to include faculty participation in decision-making. The colleges may choose to narrow the ranges for the faculty as long as they are consistent with the university policy. Colleges will need to specify how promotion and tenure criteria are met through the model. Each dean will submit his or her college's model to the Provost for approval and oversee implementation once the model is approved.

Departments/schools can choose to adopt their college model or develop their own model that is consistent with their college's parameters (i.e., units may narrow the ranges but must be within the college ranges). Each unit head will be responsible for initiating and directing the development of the department/school model. The model-development process should be designed to include faculty participation in decision-making. Units will need to specify how college promotion and tenure criteria are met through the model. If a department or school chooses to develop its own model, the unit head will submit his or her unit's model to the dean for approval and oversee implementation once the model is approved.

For its data-collection activities, the Task Force developed a form, the "Faculty Effort Allocation Form," as a tool for gathering the effort assignments of individual faculty members in the four areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and/or administrative duties (see <http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/fr/pass/FEAform.pdf>). The form was adapted from ones that have been used for many years in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences and Science and Technology. During data-collection, each unit head completed two Faculty Effort Allocation forms - one per semester in a given academic year - for all of his or her faculty members. The form is based on the workload hour concept and proved to be an effective

mechanism for reporting the effort assignments of individuals and the unit as a whole. The task force recommends that this form be a required component of Georgia Southern's implementation of the flexible faculty workload model, that it be completed by unit heads, and provided each term to the appropriate dean as a means of reporting faculty and unit effort. It is essential that the effort assignment reported by the head for a given faculty member matches that agreed upon in the annual faculty review meeting. If circumstances result in a change, then the new assignment must be documented by the unit head so the effort assignment is known to the faculty member, unit head, and dean. For purposes of evaluation, the effort assignments of an individual for the period under review shall be incorporated into the evaluation materials to ensure that the faculty member's effort distribution is available for consideration during the evaluation process.

End Notes

- ¹ Georgia Southern University has developed formal definitions for teaching, scholarship, and service, which appear in the *Faculty Handbook* section 205.01. The usage of the terms in this report is consistent with the institution's definitions. In consultation with Academic Affairs, the task force developed a definition for administration as follows:

“Administration includes activities in support of the management and/or leadership of an academic unit, program, or effort at Georgia Southern University. Administrative activities include those performed by individuals with a formal administrative title (such as dean, director, or department chair), as well as efforts such as program coordination, lab coordination, undergraduate or graduate coordination, and serving as assistant department chair.”
- ² Throughout this document, the term “college” includes the six academic colleges of Georgia Southern and the Henderson Library. The term “unit” refers to academic departments, schools, and centers and “unit head” to the administrator who leads such an academic unit (chair, director, etc.).
- ³ As used in this report, the term “regular” faculty refers to those full-time faculty members who are: tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure-track, or “temporary in a tenure-track line.” The last category includes non-resident alien faculty who are on track but cannot at present be classified as tenure-track for immigration reasons.
- ⁴ Georgia Southern University *Faculty Handbook*, Section 205.04.

Appendix I

Factors that might be considered in making faculty effort assignments

The following list identifies factors that colleges and units may wish to incorporate into their faculty effort assignment policies. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. In many instances, effort associated with an activity in a given term is not substantial enough to merit course reassignment. In such cases, banking of effort may be a means of addressing the workload associated with these efforts.

Teaching

- Class size
- Teaching assistance available to the professor (availability of GTAs, undergraduate assistants, lab supervisors, etc.)
- Developing new courses or developing on-line courses
- Modality of instruction (such as teaching with technology, clinical instruction, individualized instruction, etc.)
- Curriculum development or revision
- Coordinating multi-section courses
- Team teaching
- Number of concurrent course preparations
- Graduate (thesis or dissertation) committee assignments
- Teaching-related travel

Scholarship

- Externally funded grants or contracts for research, scholarship, and/or creative activity
- Other research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (normally resulting in no more than three hours of reassignment from the standard teaching load)

Service

- Externally funded service grants or contracts
- Other service activity (normally resulting in no more than three hours of reassignment from the standard teaching load)
- Professional service, such as [conference](#) program chair or journal editor
- Chair or member on a major System, University, College, or unit committee
- Academic advisement

Administration

- Lab Coordinator
- Curator
- Undergraduate or Graduate Coordinator
- Program-level (Director or Coordinator)
- Unit-level (Chair or Director; Acting Chair or Director; Assistant Chair or Director)
- College-level (Dean, Associate Dean, or Assistant Dean; Acting Dean, Associate Dean, or Assistant Dean)
- University-level
- Special Projects

Professional Development

- Academic study program
- Pursuing advanced degrees

References

- AAUP, 2000, Statement on faculty workload with interpretive comments: Retrieved November 2003, from <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/rbwork.htm>
- Boyer, E., 1990, Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate: Princeton, New Jersey, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 147 p.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I., 1997, Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate: San Francisco, California, Jossey-Bass, 130 p.
- Knefelkamp, L. L., 1990, Seasons of academic life: Liberal Education, v. 76, no. 3, p. 4-11.
- McMillin, L. A., and Berberet, W. G., eds., 2002, A new academic compact: Revisioning the relationship between faculty and their institutions: Boston, Massachusetts, Anker, 235 p.
- Sid W. Richardson Foundation, 1997, Restructuring the university reward system: A report by the Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum: Fort Worth, Texas, Sid W. Richardson Foundation, 41 p.

Resources

The task force researched the faculty workload policies and documents of a number of institutions as well as those of Georgia Southern's colleges and units. These materials served as important resources in the preparation of this report, and a portion of what is presented here represents adaptations of other workload policies, documents, models, or model elements. The following is a list of models or materials that were examined by task force members, a number of which served as important resources in the development of this report.

1. All formal faculty load policies in the colleges and units of Georgia Southern extant in AY 2003
2. Peer and Aspirational Institutions *

Appalachian State University
California Polytechnic State Univ. San Luis Obispo
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
The Citadel
College of Charleston
College of New Jersey
Humboldt State University
James Madison University

Mary Washington College
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
SUNY College at Geneseo
Truman State University
University of Northern Iowa
University of Tennessee – Chattanooga
University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire
Western Washington University

3. Other Institutions or Colleges

Arizona State University, College of Arts & Sciences
Arizona State University, College of Education
Augusta State University
Drexel University
Georgia State University
Idaho State University
Indiana University – Kokomo campus
Ithaca College
Kent State University
Marshall University
Middle Tennessee State University

Montclair State University
Portland State University
Syracuse University
Texas A&M University
Towson University
University of Akron
University of Colorado System
University of Maryland System
University of Wisconsin – Whitewater
Virginia Commonwealth University

- * Task force members gathered and examined workload documents available from the institutions' websites, and in some cases gathered additional information through direct contact. However, members were not able to obtain detailed information on the faculty workload policies of every peer and aspirational institution.