

RESEARCH FACULTY TASK FORCE REPORT

May 12, 2022

PREAMBLE

The *UCCS Strategic Plan 2030* identifies three core research goals to be achieved by 2030: (1) increasing the number of research-active faculty; (2) supporting student research and creative work; and (3) investing in research staff support and research infrastructure. Success measures for achieving these goals include (a) increasing our national reputation for research and creative works; **(b) providing research-active faculty with reduced teaching loads**; (c) generating gains in research and creative outputs, funding, productivity, and impact; (d) investing in expanded resources for undergraduate and graduate student and faculty researchers; and (e) building a supportive, sustainable, and effective research organization (*UCCS Strategic Plan 2030*, p.16).

To guide UCCS towards reaching these goals and achieving these success measures, the Provost's Office, in Spring 2021, created the Research Workload Task Force 2021-2022, to outline a path forward for meeting the strategic goal of reducing teaching loads for research active faculty. The Task Force's charge is to "research and consider faculty workload options at UCCS and outline at least three viable action plans for review by Academic Affairs leadership and Cabinet" (*Research Workload Task Force 2021-2022*). The Task Force's charging document identifies three specific tasks for Task Force members:

1. Review and evaluate current differential workload policies at UCCS and at other peer institutions
2. Identify at least three viable models that meet the strategic plan goal to provide research active faculty with more time for research
3. Develop a plan for each of at least three options that outlines key issues, challenges, implementation strategies, and possible timelines

The Workload Task Force is made up of Rex Welshon, Professor, Department of Philosophy, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences (co-chair); Jessi Smith, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research (current co-chair); Joseph Taylor, Assistant Professor, College of Education; Michael Kisley, Professor, Department of Psychology, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences; Deborah Kenney, Professor, Nursing, Helen and Arthur E. Johnson Bethel College of Nursing; Jill Bradley-Geist, Assistant Professor, College of Business; Eugenia Olesnicky Killian, Associate Professor, Department of Biology, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences; Lynn Gates, Assistant Professor, Kraemer Family Library; and T.S. Kalkur, Professor, Department of Electrical and Computing Engineering, College of Engineering.

This report of the Task Force's undertakings and recommendations is presented in three parts. In section A, we review the Task Force's work in Spring and Fall Semesters 2021; In Section B, we review the Task Force's work in Spring Semester 2022; and in Section C, we present the Task Force's model and three implementation plans.

SECTION A: REVIEW OF TASK FORCE WORK DURING SPRING SEMESTER 2021 AND FALL SEMESTER, 2021

(1) The Task Force met for the first time, April 23, 2021. At that meeting, the Task Force:

- Reviewed the charge from Provost Tom Christensen
- Discussed with Provost Christensen various facets of the charge, including the fiscal implications of our proposals
- Discussed with Provost Christensen the various constituencies implicated in the Task Force’s work, including Faculty Governance, Dean’s Council, the Office of Research, and the Provost’s Office
- Confirmed that the Task Force’s proposals will be submitted to the Provost’s Office by May 2022
- Agreed to investigate what our peer institutions do regarding research active faculty
- Agreed to use the TEAMS page as the information center for the Task Force

(2) The Task Force next met on September 29, 2021. At that meeting, the Task Force:

- Agreed that a statement defining and delimiting ‘research active faculty’ will be part of our report to the Provost. This statement will specify that ‘research’ includes creative works, scholarship, research, and all other areas found on campus
- Assigned Task Force members to investigate and identify research policies, practices, and procedures at UCCS’s peer institutions
- Agreed to host two listening sessions, each in November 2021, for research active faculty to discuss their concerns regarding their time commitments to teaching, research and services
- Agreed to survey UCCS faculty in January 2022 about their concerns regarding time commitments to teaching, research and service
- Assigned Mike Kisley to reach out to IRC faculty regarding the Task Force’s efforts

(3) The Task Force next met on October 28, 2021. At that meeting, the Task Force:

- Reviewed peer institution research policies, practices, and procedures. The results of that investigatory work have been collated in a document—“Peer Institutions Workload Policies”—available at the Task Force’s TEAMS page
- Brainstormed and created the questions to be asked at the two November listening sessions for faculty
- Began discussion of the Faculty Assembly Survey to be sent out to faculty in January 2022

- Began discussion of a cost analysis of going from a 5 course/AY default teaching load for TT and T faculty to a 4 course/AY default teaching load for TT and T faculty and discussed exploring the fiscal implications of such a transition but not letting those implications guide our possible proposals
- Agreed that Rex would put together the update report for the Provost
- Agreed that Rex would meet with the Faculty Assembly's Committee on Research

(4) The Task Force next met on December 7, 2021. At that meeting, the Task Force:

- Discussed the results of the two listening sessions held in November. Salient comments included:
 - Lower the TT and T default teaching load to 4 courses/AY
 - Cleaning up the 40-40-20 workload across all ranks: a 3 credit course should be about 10% of a TT faculty workload, not, as is currently the case, about 8.25%
 - Reveal some of the 'invisible' forms of teaching such as mentoring, independent studies, course preparation, and graduate level instruction
 - Provide additional funding for research activities
 - Get more assistance for research active faculty (graduate students, etc)
 - Review course buyout policies and procedures across campus
 - Review service expectations
 - Review differentiated workload policy and make these policies much more robust
- Discussed the Faculty Assembly Survey on Research Active Faculty Workloads
- Agreed that Rex would be the clearing house for submitted questions from Task Force members for the Faculty Assembly Survey on Research Active Faculty Workloads
- Agreed that Mike Kisley and Joe Taylor would put the survey together in Qualtrix from the proposed survey questions that Rex collates and submit it for final review by no later than December 12, 2021
- Agreed that the reviewed survey would be forwarded to Faculty Assembly President David Moon by no later than December 15, 2021

SECTION B: REVIEW OF TASK FORCE WORK SPRING SEMESTER 2022

(1) Before the Task Force's first meeting during Spring Semester, 2022, in February, the FRA Faculty Survey on Research Faculty Workloads was distributed and completed by UCCS faculty.

- The FRA Survey was sent to 293 TT and T faculty. 203 responses were received, a 69.2% response rate. Of those who responded, 192/203 answered every question. 37% of respondents (75) were Assistant Professors; 24% of respondents (49) were Associate Professors; 31% of respondents (62) were Full Professors; and 8% of respondents (17) did not state rank.

(2) The Task Force met on February 9, 2022, to discuss the survey results. Here is a summary of our discussion.

- *Q1 asked faculty to rank six different ways to support research active faculty's research: (i) lower course load/year; (ii) TA support; (iii) fewer class preps/year; (iv) paid research assistants; (v) summer research stipends; (vi) reduced teaching or graduate student mentoring*
 - A. 69% of all responding faculty identified lower course load/year as the single most useful strategy for providing research active faculty more time for research. When disaggregated by rank, this finding remained: 66% of Assistant Professors, 78% of Associate Professors, and 69% of Full Professors thought lowering course loads/year is the most useful strategy for providing research active faculty more time for research.
 - B. None of the other choices were nearly as frequent for responding faculty as lowering course load/year. Still, providing more robust TA support, preparing for fewer classes/year, providing paid research assistants, providing summer research stipends, and reducing graduate student mentoring were each identified as other useful strategies for providing research active faculty more time for research.
- *Q2 asked faculty to provide other ways to support research active faculty's research. Responses varied. However, the following trends were identified:*
 - A. OSPRI needs more infrastructure to support and encourage pre-tenure TT faculty to be research active. A statistician or stats center was also frequently suggested.
 - B. Sharing software resources across CU campuses (databases, RedCap, etc.) would be helpful
 - C. Faculty teaching loads need to be considered for pre-tenure TT faculty, especially offloads for grant-writing, pubs, independent studies, student advising, no overloads. One innovative idea was to have rolling release time among TT and tenured faculty—rolling course releases through academic years across faculty in a given department/program

- D. Service requirements need to be decreased
- *Q3 asked faculty to identify their contracted workload.*
 - A. 64% of respondents reported that their contracted workload was 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service. The remaining 36% varied, some with more than 40% devoted to research, some with less than 40% devoted to research. However, across all respondents, 87% reported that their research workload was at least 40%, while 13% reported that their research workload was less than 40%
 - *Q4 asked faculty what, in their experience, what percent of their workload was actually dedicated to research.*
 - A. Answers varied: There was a significant difference between faculty's contractual workload dedicated to research (item Q3 above, typically 40-40-20) and how faculty reported *actually* spending their time. The mode among respondents was 20% of their time on research with a mean of 27% (for those who reported the typical 40-40-20 workload). Such results indicate that faculty do not experience sufficient time to allocate the expected time to their research.
 - *Q5 asked faculty to rate themselves on a scale reflecting their research activity, from 'Not at all,' to 'Slightly,' to 'Moderately,' to 'Very,' to 'Extremely'.*
 - A. <2% of respondents ranked themselves Not at all; 11% of respondents ranked themselves as Slightly; 30% of respondents ranked themselves as Moderately; 29% of respondents ranked themselves as Very; and 29% of respondents ranked themselves as Extremely. So, almost 90% of respondents ranked themselves as moderately research active or more.
 - *Q6 asked faculty why they ranked themselves as they did in Q5. Responses varied. However, the following trends were identified:*
 - A. Explanations split into two general sorts: the first explains why faculty are research active; the second explains why they are not research active
 - B. Group 1 talks about publications, research grant submissions and received, mentoring time with students, getting research awards
 - C. Group 2 talks about too much teaching, service, COVID and personal life disruptions
 - D. A number of faculty noted that research happens in the summer but not during the academic year because of the heavy teaching loads
 - E. A few faculty noted that their research requires travel and that teaching schedules impinge on their scholarship
 - F. A few faculty noted that managing equipment is a big part of the job for them as PIs in certain kinds of labs and that lab techs are needed

- *Q7 asked faculty to rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with how much time they currently have to dedicate to research/creative work on a scale from 'Extremely Dissatisfied,' to 'Moderately Dissatisfied,' to 'Slightly Dissatisfied,' to 'Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied,' to 'Slightly Satisfied,' to 'Moderately Satisfied,' to 'Extremely Satisfied'.*
 - A. 69% of all respondents (140) rated their satisfaction as either extremely dissatisfied, moderately dissatisfied, or slightly dissatisfied; 18% of all respondents (26) rated their satisfaction as either slightly satisfied, moderately satisfied, or extremely satisfied; 6% of all respondents (12) rated their satisfaction as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; and 7% of respondents (15) did not respond to this question
 - B. When the findings are disaggregated by faculty rank, 72% of all Assistant Professors are dissatisfied, 86% of all Associate Professors are dissatisfied, and 69% of all Full Professors are dissatisfied, illustrating a similar pattern of dissatisfaction across ranks.
- *Q8 asked faculty to state what they found most and least satisfying about the time they currently have for research/creative work. Responses varied. However, the following trends were noted:*
 - A. There is not enough time or energy to do research given current teaching loads and poor TA/RA support
 - B. There is too much service/administrative work requested, which limits time for research because teaching time and tasks cannot be altered
 - C. There is too much student (undergraduate and graduate) mentoring
 - D. Online teaching has been so demanding that it has cut into research time
 - E. There is inadequate research infrastructure (equipment, staff, mentoring, statistics help, graduate student funding, etc.).
 - F. The research culture across campus needs to be improved to allow dedicated continuous time for thinking and working that is not disjointed.
- *Q13 asked faculty to think about the objective of the taskforce by stating "The strategic planning process identified a "2-2" faculty course load per academic year as a target for research active faculty. As we think about how to realize that goal, where would you suggest we start?"*
 - A. 58% of respondents suggested starting with a solution that provides faculty who exceed expectations for research in their annual review a 2-2 teaching load. 52% listed this option as their second choice, easily making it the most popular starting solution.
 - B. The next preferred starting place was offering a 2-2 teaching load to new faculty hires, with 35% of respondents suggesting this as their top strategy and 58% suggesting this as their second-choice strategy.

- C. Faculty comments included giving faculty autonomy in selecting their workload each year depending on their goals, starting with all pre-tenure faculty, counting summer teaching as part of the workload credit, and being careful not to create have/have not perceptions of research active units.

(3) The Task Force next met on March 9, 2022. At that meeting, the Task Force discussed:

- David Moon's cost analysis of converting all 5 course default teaching loads to 4 course default teaching loads for tenure track and tenured faculty
- Making space for Kraemer Family Library faculty's distinct workload issues so as to increase time devoted to research
- Changes to the first rough draft of this document

(4) The Task Force next met on April 13, 2022. At that meeting, the Task Force discussed:

- Changes to the second rough draft of this document

SECTION C: LESSONS LEARNED, ONE MODEL, THREE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS, KEY ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

LESSONS LEARNED

Evaluation of peer group and sister CU policies and practices

The Task Force's research and evaluation of our sister CU campuses and our peer group institutions clarified that there is considerable variability regarding teaching loads and regarding how effort is apportioned to tenure track and tenured faculty.

- CU Boulder's default teaching load is 3 three credit hour equivalent courses per academic year across the campus, with some variation across individual colleges
- CU Denver's default teaching load is 4 three credit hour equivalent courses per academic year, with some variation across individual colleges. The current CU Denver strategic plan includes the intention to reduce the teaching load even further
- Across our peer institutions, there is wide variability in teaching loads, ranging from 3 three credit hour equivalent courses per academic year to 6 such courses/AY. UTEP, Missouri St. Louis, and UMASS Boston are at 6/AY. Cleveland State, Portland State, and Florida Atlantic vary from 5-6/AY. Maryland Baltimore County, NC Charlotte and Wichita State vary from 4-6/AY. Texas A&M Corpus Christi is at 4/AY. Nebraska-Omaha is at 3/AY

- A number of our peer institutions (Texas A&M Corpus Christi, UTEP, Nebraska-Omaha, Cleveland State) calculate “workload credits” or “workload hours” per academic year and then determine teaching loads as a function of this calculation. For example, Texas A&M Corpus Christi assumes that each tenure track or tenured faculty member must perform 24 workload credits per academic year and designates workload credits as follows:
 - A 3-credit hour course is equivalent to 3 workload credits
 - 12 workload credits per term can be from external grant funding
 - Up to 9 workload credits for admin duties/service
 - Up to 12 workload credits for research/creative work

One peer institution (UTEP) further weighs workload credits upwards for graduate education and for high enrollment courses.

Listening sessions and FRA Survey

Both the Listening Sessions and the FRA Survey made some UCCS tenure track and tenured faculty concerns abundantly clear.

- The vast majority (90%) of tenure track and tenured faculty identify themselves as either moderately, very, or extremely research active
- A strong majority (69%) of tenure track and tenured faculty are either slightly, moderately, or extremely dissatisfied with the amount of time they can devote to their scholarship, research, and creative work
- A strong majority (69%) of tenure track and tenured faculty believe that the single best solution for the inadequate amount of time they can devote to scholarship, research and creative work is decreasing the default teaching load from 5 three credit hour equivalent courses per academic year to 4 three credit hour equivalent courses per academic year
- Other concerns frequently voiced were:
 - We must acknowledge that a high service burden for tenure track and tenured faculty takes time away from scholarship, research, and creative work and disrupts the needed uninterrupted time for thinking, writing, analysis, and other scholarship, research and creative tasks
 - We must avoid creating a system that minimizes the value of teaching
 - We must avoid creating a system that favors one group of faculty members over another group

- We must do what is required to establish that a 3-credit hour course is equal to 10% of a tenure track faculty member's workload
- We must prioritize funding workload adjustments for tenure track and tenured faculty to align with strategic plan goals

Commonalities and differences in scholarship and professional/clinical practice

Any model for supporting tenure track and tenured faculty in their scholarship, research, creative work, and professional/clinical practice has to address certain commonalities across academic units and across tenure track and tenured faculty. The vast majority of tenure track and tenured faculty conduct scholarship, research, creative work, or professional service/clinical practice, as described below in A and B.

- A. Drawing from Boyer's (1990) model,¹ we may understand 'scholarship' as any intellectual or creative product that falls within one or more of the following categories:
- Scholarship of discovery – this is what most now view as basic research
 - Scholarship of integration – this is where meaning is given to facts across disciplines in the larger context. It may mean working with non-specialists in collaboration or consultation
 - Scholarship of application and translation to society – this is where we use our expertise in our special fields of knowledge and apply that expertise to real-world problems; scholarship of application can include entrepreneurship
 - Scholarship of teaching and learning – this is the serious, rigorous study of teaching and learning that evolves into the sharing of pedagogical research
 - Scholarship of creative works – this is the artistry that creates new insights and interpretations
- B. The model also has to accommodate certain differences between scholarship expectations. For example, some tenure track and tenured faculty are hired to do some professional/clinical practice, either in addition to or instead of teaching and/or scholarship/research/creative work. We may understand 'professional/clinical practice' as:
- the engagement of faculty using their professional skills to provide direct service in the discipline, solve problems, disseminate information, or improve the campus or community.

¹ Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning.

Examples of professional/clinical practice include clinical work done by Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences faculty, site observation for teacher development by College of Education faculty, and, perhaps, consulting with local companies. Professional and clinical practice with the community is critical for certain colleges and disciplines. It is common for some faculty to work with community organizations and agencies in addition to practice relevant on campus.

Commonalities and differences in teaching and librarianship

Teaching and librarianship vary considerably across colleges/professional schools and sometimes across disciplines within colleges/professional schools. For example, some tenure track and tenured faculty teach graduate level courses and mentor graduate students. Examples include most tenure track and tenured faculty in the professional schools and many tenure track and tenured faculty in LAS. Some teaching requires supervising teaching assistants. Moreover, there are different kinds of teaching:

- Delivering resident courses of varied credit hours, international courses, non-credit seminars and workshops, and distance learning programs
- Directing undergraduate and graduate projects, internships, theses, and dissertations
- Serving on and getting credit for masters and dissertation committees and other professional school and/or graduate school student committees
- Advising and mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students, and post-doctoral associates
- Directing undergraduate research programs
- Teaching courses of 3, 4, or 5 credit hours
- Teaching different kinds of courses: lecture/seminar; lab; studio art; practicum; independent study, etc.
- Mentoring honors students
- Work done by librarians

Commonalities and differences in service

Typically, service obligations are 20% of a tenure/tenure track faculty workload and range from departmental level service to college service, campus service, system service, community service, and even professional service. Service varies considerably across colleges/professional schools and sometimes across disciplines within colleges/professional schools. The service needs at UCCS are

unusually high, largely because of the need for representation in various shared governance committees at different levels and the overall low number of tenure track and tenured faculty in units who can carry out service functions.

Commonalities and differences in kinds and amounts of scholarship support

In addition to clarifying teaching and librarianship, scholarship, and service, the kind and quantity of support tenure track and tenured faculty need for their scholarship, research, creative work, and professional/clinical practice varies considerably across individuals within units, across units within a college or professional school, and across colleges and professional schools.

- All tenure track and tenured faculty share certain requirements for support. Here are some examples.
 - All tenure track and tenured require more uninterrupted time for their scholarship, research, creative work, or professional/clinical practice
 - All tenure track and tenured faculty require administrative support of some kind in order to do their scholarship, research, creative work, or professional/clinical practice
 - All tenure track and tenured faculty should be able to do their scholarship, research, creative work, or professional/clinical practice during the academic year so that they do not have to do it in the summer when they are not on contract with the University
- Many tenure track and tenured faculty require distinct kinds of support for their scholarship, research, creative work, or professional/clinical practice. Here are some examples.
 - Some tenure track and tenured faculty engage in sponsored research and require pre- and post-award support offered from their unit, college, and OSPRI and the Office of Research
 - Some tenure track and tenured faculty engage in journal article writing and book writing and require funding for open-access fees, copyediting, indexing, etc.
 - Some tenure track and tenured faculty engage in creative works and require funding for performances, recordings, studio equipment, etc.
 - Some tenure track and tenured faculty require statistics support
 - Some tenure track and tenured faculty require additional travel funding and time in the academic year for professional travel

- Some tenure track and tenured faculty require lab technician support and equipment repairs and purchases
- Some tenure track and tenured faculty require student research assistants and need support for tuition and stipends and training for their RAs offered by their unit, college, Center for Student Research, and the Graduate School
- Some tenure track and tenured faculty require lab/research/studio space and major instrumentation
- Some research students need support through the summer

THE MODEL

It is evident from our evaluation of other institutions, the listening sessions, and the FRA Survey both that the need to improve support for scholarship (research, professional/clinical practice, creative work) has become critical and urgent and that significant steps must be taken quickly to achieve the research goals of the *UCCS Strategic Plan 2030*.

The Task Force considered but eventually declined to develop three distinct models for providing research active faculty with more time for research. Instead, the Task Force recommends one model and offers three different plans for implementing the model. The Task Force moved away from providing three distinct models because the needs for greater support for research active faculty to do their research are, with some exceptions, commonly shared across the colleges and professional schools.

The single most important thing to do is decreasing the default teaching load for tenure track and tenured faculty from the typical 5 courses/AY to 4 courses/AY. However, other kinds of support, as discussed above, are also required. Hence, we now identify the shared elements of scholarship, research, creative work, and professional/clinical practice support that must be implemented in the next four years. We then identify three implementation plans for transitioning from a 5 course/AY to a 4 course/AY default teaching load for tenure track and tenured faculty. Finally, we identify key issues and challenges for each of the implementation plans.

Shared elements of the implementation plans

Shared elements of improved scholarship, research, creative work, and professional/clinical practice support that must be components of the model include the following:

- Develop accurate representations of teaching commitments and diverse teaching types and moving tenure track and tenured faculty from a 5 course/AY default teaching load to a 4 course/AY default teaching load

- The three-credit lecture course is the current standard for teaching commitment against which other kinds of teaching are compared. For tenure track and tenured faculty teaching a 5 course/AY load, each such course is currently equivalent to 8% of their workload. Consider that 40% of a standard workload for tenure track and tenured faculty is devoted to teaching, and the default teaching load is five courses/AY, which together entail that 8% of a standard workload is devoted to each 3-credit hour course. If so, however, then the amount of effort that a tenure track or tenured faculty member devotes to a three credit course is inconsistent with that of instructors, for whom each three credit course represents 11.25% of effort. After all, 90% of a standard workload for instructors is devoted to teaching and the default teaching load is 8 courses/AY. This inconsistency must be changed, or at least eased, so that each such course is equivalent to 10% of a tenure track or tenured faculty member's workload. This change can best be implemented by transitioning tenure track and tenured faculty members from a 5 course/AY default teaching load to a 4 course/AY default teaching load.
- Acknowledge and identify the diversity of types of teaching and courses that tenure track and tenured faculty engage in and credit these distinct types of teaching appropriately when fixing teaching loads. Salient considerations include the following:
 - Identify accurate workload commitments for all resident undergraduate courses of different credit hours, all international courses, all non-credit seminars and workshops, and all distance learning programs
 - Identify accurate workload commitments for all graduate and/or professional teaching, graduate projects, masters' theses, doctoral dissertations, and graduate and undergraduate internships
 - Identify accurate workload commitments for advising, directing, and mentoring undergraduate students, honors students, graduate students, and post-doctoral associates and their scholarship endeavors and projects
 - Identify accurate workload commitments for instructional work done by librarians
 - Review Colorado Department of Higher Education contact minute requirements for different kinds of courses, such as lecture/seminars; labs; studio art courses; practicums; independent studies; etc.
- Provide adequate administrative, fiscal, facility, and assistant support for scholarship, research, creative work, and professional/clinical practice
 - Most tenure track and tenured faculty require additional administrative support of some kind in order to do their scholarship, research, creative work, and professional/clinical practice

- All tenure track and tenured faculty who engage in sponsored research require pre- and post-award support offered from their unit, college, and OSPRI and the Office of Research
- Most tenure track and tenured faculty who engage in journal article writing and book writing require funding for open-access fees, copyediting, indexing, etc.
- All tenure track and tenured faculty who engage in creative works require funding for performances, recordings, studio equipment, etc.
- Some tenure track and tenured faculty require statistics support
- Some tenure track and tenured faculty require additional travel funding and time in the academic year for professional travel
- Some tenure track and tenured faculty require lab technician support and equipment repairs and purchases
- Some tenure track and tenured faculty require research assistants and need support for tuition and stipends and training for them
- Some tenure track and tenured faculty who do laboratory research or creative work require lab/research/studio space and major instrumentation

THREE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

The most consequential element of the model is moving from a 5 course/AY default teaching load for tenure track and tenured faculty to a 4 course/AY default teaching load. The Task Force has therefore developed three distinct plans for implementing this transition.

Implementation Plan 1

With the concurrence of the tenure track and tenured faculty within a college/professional school, create a newly funded program that conjoins faculty responsibility statements and differentiated workloads and create a plan to implement a 4 course/AY default teaching load for all tenure track and tenured faculty over a four-year period so that by 2026 all tenure track and tenured faculty will be on a 4 course/AY default teaching load

- Each primary unit (or college or school) will define ‘scholarship,’ ‘research,’ ‘creative work,’ and ‘professional/clinical practice’ for itself
- Each primary unit (or college or school) will define ‘research active’ for itself

- Each college/school will set aside a pool of funding for differentiated workload assignments to pay for course-buy outs and/or service off-loads and for hiring faculty at the lecturer, instructor, and assistant professor ranks to remedy the instructional capacity loss
- Each college/school will use faculty responsibility statements as a prospective mechanism for specifying workload distribution to be implemented in conjunction with the current differentiated workload mechanism
- Each college/school will permit faculty to prospectively determine their course load for the entire upcoming academic year and to determine how they will spread out their teaching load across winter, summer, fall, and spring semesters/sessions
- Each college/school will permit faculty to set goals for the coming year that include possible workload differentiation during the retrospective annual merit evaluation process.

Implementation Plan 2

In consultation with the colleges/professional schools and with the concurrence of the tenure track and tenured faculty within colleges/professional schools, phase in a 4 course/AY default teaching load for all tenure track and tenured faculty over a four-year period so that by 2026 all tenure track and tenured faculty will be on a 4 course/AY default teaching load

- In the first year, the campus will assign all newly hired TT and pre-tenure tenure track faculty a 4 course/AY default teaching load
- In the following two years (years 2-3), the campus will convert all existing 5 course/AY default teaching loads to a 4 course/AY default teaching load for all other tenure track and tenured faculty who exceeded expectations on their annual merit review for the year previous to the conversion in units offering graduate degrees

In the following year (year 4), the campus will convert all existing 5 course/AY default teaching loads a 4 course/AY default teaching load for all other tenure track and tenured faculty who exceeded expectations on their annual merit review for the year previous to the conversion in any unit

Implementation Plan 3

In consultation with the colleges/professional schools and with the concurrence of the tenure track and tenured faculty within colleges/professional schools, increase the number of new tenure track faculty in each unit by 15% and increase the number of long-term instructors in each unit by 15% to implement a 4 course/AY default teaching load over a four-year period so that by 2026 all tenure track and tenured faculty will be on a 4 course/AY default teaching load

- The addition of new tenure track faculty will reduce the service burden on other tenure track and tenured faculty
- The addition of new tenure track faculty will increase the number of classes offered
- The addition of new tenure track faculty will underwrite the move from a 5 course/AY default teaching load to a 4 course/AY default teaching load for all tenure track and tenured faculty

KEY ISSUES AND CHALLENGES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Key issues and challenges for the model as a whole

- Implementing the developed model will require funding. David Moon, President of Faculty Representative Assembly, and Robyn Marschke, Director of Institutional Research, analyzed the overall cost of going from a 5 course/AY to a 4 course/AY default teaching load. This analysis determined the following:
 - On the assumption that all instructional capacity loss is remedied by replacement lecturers, the transition will cost the campus \$1.1M
 - On the assumption that all instructional capacity loss is remedied by replacement instructors, the transition will cost the campus \$1.7M (\$2.3M with benefits)
 - On the assumption that all instructional capacity loss is remedied by replacements at the current proportion of tenure track faculty/instructors/ lecturers, the transition will cost the campus about \$2.8M (\$3.7M with benefits)
 - On the assumption that all instructional capacity loss is remedied by replacement assistant professors, the transition will cost the campus \$5.3M (\$7.3M with benefits).²

Other key issues and challenges for implementation plan 1

- This plan will provide the most flexibility for individual colleges and professional schools to implement the transition to a 4 course/AY default teaching fault as they see fit
- This plan will require significant planning and oversight at the college/professional school level

Other key issues and challenges for implementation plan 2

² *TTTF Teaching Load Reduction Costs* (2022). See Appendix A.

- This plan is the most systematic and organized plan for the campus as a whole
- This plan will require significant planning and oversight at the campus level

Other key issues and challenges for implementation plan 3

- This plan is the most expensive plan because it implements the transition from 5 courses/AY to 4 courses/AY entirely by hiring new assistant professors and instructors
- This plan will require significant additional space and start-up costs in a short amount of time
- This plan will address burdensome service duties currently faced by tenure track and tenured faculty since instructional loss is remedied by hiring only new assistant professors