



Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25[A]) (Senate Document #22-23-12)

TO Darryll J. Pines | President

FROM Rochelle Newman | Chair, University Senate

I am pleased to forward the accompanying legislation for your consideration and approval. Peter Sunderland, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25[A]) (Senate Document #22-23-12), which the University Senate approved at its meeting on April 26, 2023. Please inform the Senate of your decision and any administrative action related to your conclusion.

Approved:

**Darryll J. Pines
President**

Date:

May 8, 2023

Copies of this approval and the accompanying legislation will be forwarded to:

Jennifer King Rice, Senior Vice President and Provost
Veronica Marin, Executive Secretary and Director, University Senate
Jen Gartner, Interim Vice President and General Counsel
Dylan Baker, Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Elizabeth Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs
Rhonda Smith, Director, Division of Academic Affairs
Michele Eastman, Assistant President and Chief of Staff
Christopher Jarzynski, Chair-Elect, University Senate
Ellen D. Williams, Past Chair, University Senate
Peter Sunderland, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee



Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25 [A])

PRESENTED BY Peter Sunderland, Chair

REVIEW DATES SEC – April 14, 2023 | SENATE – April 26, 2023

VOTING METHOD In a single vote

RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT [II-1.25\(A\) – University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities](#)

NECESSARY APPROVALS Senate, President

ISSUE

In June 2019, the University System of Maryland (USM) revised its full-time faculty workload and responsibilities policy and institution reporting requirements. The Senior Vice President and Provost formed two working groups to propose revisions to the University’s faculty workload and responsibilities policy to comply with the USM policy. In March 2022, President Pines approved a revised University Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities on an interim basis pending Senate review.

In Fall 2022, the Senate Executive Committee charged the Faculty Affairs Committee with reviewing the University Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities to consider whether the policy should be recommended for final approval.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the proposed revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25 [A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

In addition, the committee recommends that the faculty workload guidance developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs be revised in accordance with the committee’s recommended policy revisions and that the Faculty Affairs Committee be charged with reviewing the revised administrative guidance developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Faculty Affairs Committee began its review of the interim policy in October 2022. The committee reviewed the USM Policy on Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25) and the interim University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25 [A]). The committee also reviewed the research materials and sample workload policies that the interim policy working groups provided.

The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs gave the committee an overview of the working groups' process for developing the interim policy, and the committee met with three members of the interim policy working group. The committee also consulted with the Associate Director & Research Assistant Professor of ADVANCE to discuss strategies for fair, equitable, and effective faculty workload policy development and implementation. As recommended in the charge, the committee also met with a representative of the University's Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) to discuss how faculty workload is reported to USM. To gain insight into the University's policy impact on unit-level policy development, committee members individually consulted with Deans, Unit Heads, Department Chairs, and other members of departments and Colleges and Schools.

During its review of the interim policy, the Faculty Affairs Committee considered the equity principles of the University policy, the policy guidance for unit-level policy development, and the clarity of the policy workload expectations requirements, particularly related to baseline teaching workload expectations. The committee determined that the policy adequately stated equity principles, but it recommended adding a requirement that unit-level policies be developed in accordance with the unit's governance procedures. The committee also valued the flexibility that the University policy provided for unit-level policies to be responsive to shifts in faculty roles and responsibilities among the workload categories. The committee recommended that the policy include provisions clarifying that workload expectations unit policies may consider whether course equivalents are permitted to accumulate over a three-year period. The committee also recommended additional revisions to reinforce that all unit workload policies, included those developed by Libraries and the University of Maryland Extension (UME), are subject to the review and approval procedures provided in the University policy.

After due consideration, the Faculty Affairs Committee proposed revisions to the interim policy and an associated administrative recommendation.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could decline to approve the recommendations. However, the interim policy would stand as the permanent policy, and the University would lose an opportunity to improve the policy.

RISKS

There are no risks to the University in adopting these recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no known financial implications in adopting the recommendation.



Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25 [A]) (Senate Document #22-23-12)

2022-2023 Committee Members

Peter Sunderland (Chair)
John Bertot (Ex officio Provost's Rep)
Holly Brewer (Ex officio CUSF Rep)
Pei-Ying Chuang (Graduate Student)
Michele Eastman (Ex officio President's Rep),
Cecily Holland (Staff)
Birthe Kjellerup (Faculty)
Gideon Mark (Faculty Senator)
Jennifer Mullinax (Faculty)
Karen O'Brien (Ex officio Ombuds Officer)
Jessica O'Hara (Faculty)
Colleen O'Neal (Faculty)
Terry Owen (Faculty)

Andrew Ristvey (Faculty Senator)
Jennifer Wallace (Faculty Senator)
Rythee Lambert-Jones (Ex officio Director of Human Resources Rep)
Sean Mussenden (Faculty Senator)
Autumn Perkey (Graduate Student)
Syed Zaidi (Undergraduate Student)

Date of Submission

April 2023

BACKGROUND

In 1994, the University System of Maryland (USM) adopted a policy on faculty workload and responsibilities "to promote optimal performance by the University System of Maryland and by each of its institutions in meeting the needs and expectations of its students and other stakeholders, and to provide mechanisms that will ensure public accountability for that performance." (Appendix 1). The USM policy provided guidelines for the standard faculty workload expectations in instruction, research/scholarship, and service and charged each institution to establish policies that provide standard expectations for faculty workload.

Since implementing its Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities, USM revised the policy and its guidance related to the annual faculty workload accounting and reporting requirements for system institutions but did not change substantially the standard workload expectations. In June 2019, USM revised the standard faculty workload expectations to recognize that the nature of faculty work had evolved since 1994, noting that faculty workload reporting needs to "improve accuracy and coverage, align with current practice, and incentivize policy goals around academic innovation and student success." (Appendix 2).

The 2019 USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities revisions included:

- Shifting institution reporting from course units taught per faculty member to credit hour production by the following USM faculty type groupings:
 - Full-time Tenured/Tenure Track,
 - Full-time Non-Tenured/Tenure Track Instructional,
 - Full-time Non-Tenured/Tenure Track Research,
 - Teaching Assistant/Graduate Assistant, and
 - Other Part-Time Instructional Staff;

- Adjusting the standard workload expectations for a research institution to:
 - Teaching: 45% - 55%,
 - Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity: 35% - 45%, and
 - Service: 5% - 20%;
- Expanding teaching effort to include course/curriculum design; and
- Streamlining the reporting process to the institution-level instead of department or academic unit-level.

While the USM policy provides flexibility for member institutions to set their standard expectations for faculty workload, each institution is obligated to ensure that it generates enough credit hours for students to complete their degrees in a timely manner.

The University of Maryland policy on faculty workload had not been updated since 1994 and did not address other recent USM policy changes. In early spring 2020, the Senior Vice President and Provost formed two working groups to propose revisions to the University faculty workload policy to comply with the revised USM policies. One working group included deans and department chairs to address high-level issues such as defining workload and structuring the University policy. Another working group included associate deans, department chairs, faculty, and Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment representatives. This group addressed operational and implementation matters related to the policy. During its research and consideration of recommendations for the University's faculty workload policy, the working groups determined that there needed to be a separate policy for Professional Track Faculty (PTK) because of the variations in titles and the instructional responsibilities for that faculty group. Therefore, the working groups proposed a workload and responsibilities policy for full-time faculty holding tenured and tenure-track positions and providing for the Libraries and the University of Maryland Extension to develop their workload areas and expectations policies.

In March 2022, President Pines approved revisions to the University Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities on an interim basis pending Senate review. In Fall 2022, at the request of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, John Bertot, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Faculty Affairs Committee with reviewing the interim policy and considering whether the policy should be recommended for final approval. (Appendix 3).

CURRENT UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY

The interim University Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities requires each unit with tenured and tenure-track faculty members to develop a workload policy that provides fair and equitable guidelines that enable each unit and/or program to best utilize its faculty members in alignment with the policy and the missions of the University, College/School, and the unit. The Libraries and the University of Maryland Extension are directed to develop faculty workload policies that focus on their faculty workload areas and expectations. Research Units are directed to establish minimum workload expectations for jointly appointed tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The interim policy includes standard workload expectations for tenured and tenure-track faculty for teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; service; administration; and extension

responsibilities, if appropriate. The interim University policy advises that the University will report to USM annually faculty workload based on the following expectations:

- Teaching percentage of total effort is approximately 50%,
- Research, scholarship, or creative activities percentage of total effort is approximately 40%, and
- Service percentage of total effort is approximately 10%.

The research, scholarship, or creative activities and service categories are new categories that were not in the University's prior policy. The interim policy provides that tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to engage in assigned workload responsibilities in each category. The baseline teaching effort for a full-time equivalent (100%) tenured and tenure-track faculty is five course units per academic year. A course unit normally is defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. The interim policy includes this baseline in response to USM's requirement that universities report credit hour production. Additionally, the policy includes a cap on credit earned for dissertations to ensure that tenured and tenure-track faculty spend time in the classroom.

Specific workload assignments can be adjusted based on unit-level and University policies and procedures, such as sabbatical leave, Leave with Pay, Family Medical Leave, and retirement agreements. However, tenured and tenure-track faculty members must teach at least one instruction-based course unit equivalent per academic year, with exceptions approved by the Dean or designee for departmentalized Colleges and by the Senior Vice President and Provost or designee for non-departmentalized Colleges.

The University policy identifies several considerations that the units may consider to adjust the baseline teaching expectation. Consistent with the USM policy, these considerations in the University policy include class size, credit hours produced, co-teaching, modality and level of instruction, disciplinary expectations, and accreditation requirements. The University policy also includes research efforts, advising, and mentoring as factors units may consider in determining faculty teaching workload expectations, in addition to other factors the units deem relevant. Additionally, the policy lists partial course unit allocation for dissertation and doctoral level individual studies, master's thesis and other graduate level individual studies, and undergraduate level individual studies.

While faculty are expected to meet workload expectations on an annual basis, unit policies can consider averaging the workload over a period of time (3 years, for example) to allow for workload fluctuations within that time period. The University policy also directs unit policies to address whether course releases due to external fellowships, awards, or sponsored research are permissible and how workload is rebalanced under specific circumstances, such as the faculty member being engaged in responsibilities or activities that advance the University's mission and operations; the faculty member's desire to voluntarily rebalance work to engage in one category of responsibility more than another; or the faculty member is determined under periodic or post-tenure review not to have met the unit expectations in one or more areas of the expected performance in the workload categories.

The University policy requires unit heads, or deans in non-departmentalized colleges, to prepare an annual summary report of the assigned faculty member workload expectations that is available to all faculty in the unit. The University policy includes guidance on the process for units to develop and approve their policies. It also identifies the responsibilities of the Deans and the Senior Vice President and Provost for approving policies and reporting to USM.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Faculty Affairs Committee began reviewing the interim University Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities at its October 18, 2022 meeting. The committee received a presentation from ex officio member Associate Provost Bertot that reviewed the interim policy working groups' process for revising the University's faculty workload policy. The committee was provided the research materials that the working groups considered, which included several research papers on defining faculty workload expectations and policies and sample policies, guidance, and dashboards from other universities. Bertot also briefed the committee on the expert subject matter consultations and stakeholder presentations and meetings that the working groups conducted.

The committee met with three interim policy working group members. The working group representatives briefed the committee on the principles and matters they considered. The working group representatives commented it was challenging to develop a University policy because units approach workload differently based on their mission and disciplinary norms, particularly related to teaching and research. Therefore, the focus for developing the policy, in addition to complying with the USM policy, was to balance and leverage faculty members' professional aspirations in a context that addresses all the categories of workload responsibilities—teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, and service, and promotes fair and equitable workloads across the faculty. The working group representatives described the University policy as a baseline for all unit policies with the flexibility to adjust the allocation of responsibilities among all the workload category responsibilities. The representatives also noted that the policy also allows units to adjust workload expectations based on the varying roles and shifts in focus that faculty fulfill during their careers, especially between teaching and research.

The committee met with Dawn Culpepper, Associate Director & Research Assistant Professor of ADVANCE, to discuss strategies for fair, equitable, and effective faculty workload policy development and implementation. Culpepper provided background information on the Faculty Workload and Rewards Project (FWRP), a 5-year research project that sought to enhance equity in the way faculty workload is addressed, assigned, and rewarded. The project involved 53 departments across 20 institutions, most of which had a STEM or research focus.

Through the consultation with Culpepper, the committee learned about several departmental structural issues and faculty concerns about fair distribution of teaching and recognition of service that the research project identified. Culpepper shared several strategies to address these concerns. The recommendations included developing unit policies collaboratively with department members subject to the unit's normal shared governance practices and units being transparent about workload expectations by publishing dashboards with data and rubrics detailing the type of work for each workload category that will be considered for fulfilling workload responsibilities by faculty type. Units also should consider adopting a teaching credit system that outlines how many credits faculty can receive for a given teaching activity or a service credit system that outlines the credit values of committees or service activities according to intensity. Culpepper also noted that it is important for unit policies to provide flexibility and multiple pathways for faculty to meet their workload expectations.

Culpepper informed the committee that she believed the University's policy on faculty workload and responsibilities provides units with the appropriate guidance and discretion to create and implement unit policies that address the concerns identified through the FWRP. She also opined that the

University policy sufficiently states a commitment to equity in the workload policy development and implementation processes.

As recommended in the charge, the committee also met with the IRPA Assistant Director, Decision Support, to discuss how faculty workload is reported to USM. During this meeting, the committee was informed USM requires the University to report student credit hours by faculty type (full-time tenured/tenure track, full-time non-tenured/tenure track instructional, full-time non-tenured/tenure track research, teaching assistant/graduate assistant, and other part-time instructional staff) and by course level (lower-division, upper-division, master's courses, doctoral courses, and thesis/dissertation). USM also requires reporting the number of faculty in eleven category measures of research and scholarly/creative activities related to publications; juried, invited, or other creative works; externally funded grants and contracts; leadership positions in professional societies; and days spent in public service. IRPA collects this data for USM reporting through the Office of Research Administration and Faculty Success. The committee was informed that IRPA includes all faculty in its headcount and productivity report, regardless of funding sources, but USM reporting policies apply only to state-funded faculty.

To gain insight into the University's policy impact on unit-level policy development, committee members individually consulted with Deans, Unit Heads, Department Chairs, and other members of departments and Colleges and Schools. Early feedback from those charged with developing their unit policies was that the December 7, 2022 deadline for implementing the unit-level policies was too ambitious. Based on the committee's recommendation and with the support of the Senate Leadership, President Pines approved setting May 23, 2023, the last day of the spring semester, as the new deadline for developing unit-level policies.

Based on the feedback from the unit-level consultations and its review of the policy, the committee focused much of its deliberations on the equity principles of the University policy, the unit-level policy development process, and the clarity of the policy guidance for unit-level policy requirements, particularly related to baseline teaching workload expectations. The committee made a presentation at the March 8, 2023 Senate meeting to get feedback from the Senators on these matters. The feedback from that presentation is included in the discussion below.

Equity and Transparency

As it reviewed the University policy, the committee noted and appreciated the references to the importance of equity. Each unit is directed to develop a policy that "sets forth fair and equitable guidelines," and the review and approval responsibilities for Unit Heads, Deans, and the Senior Vice President and Provost, including ensuring that the unit policies are applied equitably. The interim University policy also requires unit policies to include clear procedures for buy-outs to allow course releases to be applied consistently and equitably. Given the provisions currently in the interim policy, the committee determined that it was unnecessary to revise the University policy to include additional language about equity. However, the committee decided that the policy should provide more guidance on the policy development process and procedures for reviewing and changing faculty members' workload expectations.

The committee recommended that the University policy state that the unit-level faculty workload policies must be developed in accordance with the unit's governance procedures. Additionally, in response to concerns raised about the possibility of an administrator making unilateral changes to a faculty member's workload expectations, the committee also recommended that any workload allocation changes should be informed by the merit and performance reviews established by unit

and University policies and procedures. These additional changes were recommended to provide stability for faculty workload expectations even when there are changes in administrators.

Related to equity, the committee considered whether the academic administrators who are not subject to the faculty workload policy should be adjusted. The University policy follows the USM policy provision that the policy does not apply to individuals who hold faculty rank but who are assigned to administrative duties outside the department or equivalent academic units. However, the University policy lists more examples of the excluded positions than the USM policy and includes Associate Deans and Associate Provosts. At its March 2023 Senate presentation, the committee sought feedback on whether the current list of tenured/tenure-track faculty exempt from the University faculty workload policy should be changed. The consensus among the Senators was that there should be no changes. Accordingly, the committee did not make a recommendation to change the substance of that provision.

Allocation of Workload

The interim University policy states that the baseline teaching effort for full-time equivalent (100% FTE) tenured and tenure-track faculty members is five course units per academic year. The interim policy does not include a maximum number of courses that a faculty member can be assigned to satisfy their teaching effort. The committee discussed concerns that with five courses as the baseline for 50 % teaching effort, a faculty member with 100% teaching effort could be required to teach ten courses.

The committee noted that the interim University policy provides flexibility for Colleges and Schools to accommodate different workload practices among units, including having a different teaching expectations baseline based on several considerations such as class size, credit hours produced, co-teaching, modality of instruction, level of instruction, disciplinary expectations, and accreditation requirements. Additionally, since the USM policy contemplates that state-funded faculty will teach at least one course and will be engaged in each workload category, the category ranges in the University policy do not have a minimum of 0% or maximum of 100%.

The committee determined that since there are expectations that faculty would have workload in all the categories, research and service in addition to teaching, it was not reasonable for the University policy to be interpreted as 100 % teaching workload requiring ten classes per academic year. However, since the five-course baseline teaching effort was a significant change from the University's prior faculty workload policy, which set five courses as the maximum teaching workload, the committee decided to get feedback from Senators on this issue at its presentation at the March Senate meeting. The committee asked the Senate to consider whether the University policy should state a maximum teaching workload that ranged from five to eight courses. The Senate consensus was that the University policy should not specify a maximum number of courses to satisfy the teaching effort workload.

Based on the feedback from the Senate presentation, the committee did not recommend that the University policy include a cap on the number of courses to satisfy the teaching workload allocation. The committee determined that it was more important for units to have flexibility in determining workload allocations to accommodate factors that might not be within the faculty member's control. For example, being able to accommodate a faculty member who may need to adjust their teaching workload because they needed to shift from research due to loss of funding or shift to research because of the insurgence of funding. To emphasize this flexibility, the committee recommended

that the policy include a statement that the unit policies may consider whether course equivalents are permitted to accumulate over up to three years.

Clarification of Policy Guidance

Although the Libraries and UME are charged with developing their own workload policies, the committee identified several matters related to unit tenured and tenure-track faculty with partial extension appointments. The same considerations that support UME developing its own faculty workload policy counsel consideration of unique factors that affect unit faculty with partial extension appointments. A significant consideration was how teaching workload expectations for these faculty should be set in balance with their field work responsibilities.

The feedback the committee received through its consultations with unit heads, combined with its discussions, demonstrated to the committee that it would be difficult, and probably inefficient, for the University policy to establish workload expectations for unit faculty with partial extension appointments. However, based on the value the committee placed on equity and transparency, the committee recommended that the University policy include a provision requiring units with faculty with partial extension appointments to develop a section of their faculty workload policy that addresses this faculty specifically.

The committee also recommended revisions to the University policy that clarified that the faculty workload policies developed by the Libraries and UME must comply with the review and approval provisions of the University policy.

Administrative Matters

The committee agreed with the recommendation made at the Senate March meeting to change the policy name to Policy on Workload and Responsibilities for Full-Time Tenured, Tenure-Track, Permanent Status, and Permanent Status-Track Faculty to reflect the faculty to whom the policy applies more accurately. The committee also recommended that the approval and review provisions be stated as requirements.

The committee recognizes that its recommended policy revisions might impact the guidance on developing and implementing unit-level faculty workload policies that the Office of Faculty Affairs provides. Therefore, the committee recommends that it be charged with reviewing the revised guidance.

RECOMMENDATION

Policy Recommendation

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the proposed revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25[A]), as shown immediately following this report, be approved.

Administrative Recommendation

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the faculty workload guidance developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs be revised in accordance with the committee's recommended policy

revisions and that the Faculty Affairs Committee be charged with reviewing the revised administrative guidance developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — II-1.25 USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities

Appendix 2 — June 21, 2019 Board of Regents Meeting – Public Session Agenda, pp. 166-172

Appendix 3 — Charge from the Senate Executive Committee



II-1.25(A) UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON ~~FULL-TIME FACULTY~~ WORKLOAD AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TENURED, TENURE-TRACK, PERMANENT STATUS, AND PERMANENT STATUS-TRACK FACULTY

(Approved by the President November 21, 1994; Amended and approved March 4, 2022 on an interim basis, pending Senate review-~~March 4, 2022~~; Technical amendments approved by the President December 7, 2022)

I. PURPOSE

The University of Maryland's ("the University") mission is to achieve excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activities, and public service. As the State's flagship University, and one of the country's first land grant institutions, the University seeks to educate students and advance knowledge in areas of importance to the State, the nation, and the world, and to be a preeminent national center for research, innovation, and graduate and undergraduate education. Taken together, basic and applied research, scholarship, creative activities, teaching, Extension programming, librarianship, service, and administrative duties are important elements of faculty workload that enable the University to fulfill its mission. In order to ensure that faculty members meet their workload expectations and that the University complies with the University of System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25), as amended on June 21, 2019, the University establishes the following Policy on ~~Full-Time Faculty~~ Workload and Responsibilities (~~for Full-Time Tenured, Tenure-Track, Permanent Status, and Permanent Status-Track Faculty~~ (the "Policy").

II. DEFINITIONS

- A. "Academic Unit" means a department, College, School, or other University entity in which a faculty member has an appointment with assigned teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; service; ~~administration~~administrative; librarianship; and/or Extension responsibilities. Faculty members with joint appointments across Academic Units may have responsibilities in more than one Unit.
- B. "Research Unit" means a Unit such as a University-recognized center or institute in which the faculty member has an appointment with assigned research, administrative, or other responsibilities. Faculty members with joint appointments across Academic and Research Units may have responsibilities in more than one Unit.
- C. "Unit" means either an Academic or Research Unit.
- D. "Unit Head" means a Department Chair, Dean, Director, or any University administrator who has a supervisory relationship to a faculty member ~~in relation~~with respect to determining, assigning, and/or reviewing faculty workload expectations.

III. APPLICABILITY

A. This Policy applies to the following individuals:

1. All faculty holding tenured and tenure-track positions, as defined in section I.A.2-4 of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) of Faculty (II-1.00~~[(A)]~~), except as noted below in section III.B; and,
2. All faculty who, while holding tenured or tenure-track faculty rank, are classified as administrators and perform their administrative duties at the level of an academic department or equivalent Academic Unit, such as Chairs, Assistant Chairs, and program Directors.

B. ~~This Policy does~~ Apart from section V.C.3, sections IV and V and the associated guidance do not apply to:

1. Individuals who hold a tenured or tenure-track faculty rank and are assigned to administrative duties outside of their Academic Unit(s), ~~including deans, vice presidents, presidents, associate provosts, associate deans, and directors of University-recognized centers and institutes~~ for example Associate Deans, Associate Provosts, Deans, Presidents, Provosts, Research Unit Heads, and Vice Presidents.
2. Field faculty as defined in section I.C.4-6 of the University's APT Policy and Procedures.
 - a. The University of Maryland Extension is directed to develop a faculty workload policy, pursuant to the Unit's governance procedures and focused on its faculty workload areas and expectations, by or before May 23, 2023.
 - b. Any Unit with Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty with partial Extension appointments is directed to develop an Extension-specific faculty workload policy section, pursuant to the Unit's governance procedures and focused on its faculty workload areas and expectations, by or before May 23, 2023.
- 2.3. ~~Faculty holding permanent status and permanent status-track positions, as defined in section I.E.1-4 of the University's APT Policy~~ and Procedures.
 - a. The Libraries are directed to develop a faculty workload policy, pursuant to the Unit's governance procedures and focused on their faculty workload areas and expectations, by or before May 23, 2023.
- 3.1. ~~Field faculty as defined in I.C.4-6 of the University's APT policy~~

~~a. The University of Maryland Extension is directed to develop a faculty workload policy focused on its faculty workload areas and expectations by or before May 23, 2023.~~

~~4. Professional Track Faculty as defined in the University's Policy on Professional Track Faculty (II-1.00[G]).~~

~~5. All part-time and adjunct faculty.~~

- C. Research Units shall establish minimum workload expectations for jointly-appointed tenured and tenure-track faculty that are aligned with the missions of the University, College or School, and Research Unit.
1. Research Units must establish a review process that evaluates each tenured and tenure-track faculty member at least once every five (5) years.
 2. The standards for Research Unit appointments and reviews should be established at the onset of an appointment and in conjunction with the faculty member's tenure home Unit.

IV. POLICY AND PROCEDURES

- A. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members may have workload responsibilities in the following broad areas: teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; and service. In addition, some faculty members may have administrative and/or Extension responsibilities.
- B. Each Unit in which tenured and tenure-track faculty members are appointed shall establish, publish, and monitor a workload policy that sets forth fair and equitable guidelines that enable each Unit and/or program to best utilize its faculty members and align their efforts in accordance with this Policy, ~~and~~ in alignment with the missions of the University, College ~~or~~ School, and Unit. Any workload allocation changes should be informed by merit and performance reviews as established by Unit and University policies and procedures and subject to review by the next-level administrator upon the appeal of any faculty member.
- C. The established policies shall address expectations of tenured and tenure-track faculty members and give appropriate weight to the teaching; research, scholarship, or creative activities; service; administration; and Extension responsibilities, if appropriate.
- D. The USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25) sets standard workload expectations for tenured and tenure-track faculty members at research institutions. The University reports faculty workload annually to ~~the~~ USM based on the following expectations: ~~;~~

1. Teaching percentage of total effort is approximately 50%;
 2. Research, scholarship, or creative activities percentage of total effort is approximately 40%; and
 3. Service percentage of total effort is approximately 10%.
- E. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to engage in assigned workload responsibilities in all three areas defined in [section IV.D.1-3](#). Specific workload assignments may be adjusted according to Unit-level and University policies and procedures (e.g., sabbatical leave, Leave without Pay, Family [and](#) Medical Leave, ~~and~~ retirement agreements, [and administrative or other service assignments](#)).
- F. The baseline teaching effort for full-time equivalent (100% FTE) tenured and tenure-track faculty members is five (5) course units per academic year. A course unit is normally defined as equivalent to a three-credit course.
1. Units may adjust the baseline teaching expectation in their established workload policies by taking into account class size, credit hours produced, co-teaching, modality of instruction, level of instruction, disciplinary expectations, accreditation requirements, research efforts, advising, mentoring, and other factors deemed relevant in determining faculty teaching expectations.
 2. Partial course unit allocation is permissible for:
 - a. Dissertation and doctoral level individual studies (800-899), nine (9) credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit;
 - b. Masters thesis (799), 12 credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit;
 - c. Other graduate level individual studies (500-798), 18 credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit; and
 - d. Undergraduate level individual studies (100-499), 21 credit hours is equivalent to one (1) course unit.
 3. Partial course unit allocation may count towards no more than two (2) units of instructional effort per faculty member per academic year.
 4. ~~Unit workload policies may consider whether course equivalents may accumulate over a period of time (e.g., two or three years).~~ Faculty instructional loads may be adjusted according to Unit-level and University policies and procedures (e.g., sabbatical leave, Leave without Pay, [Family and Medical Leave](#), retirement agreements, ~~service~~ and administrative [or other service](#) assignments). However, tenured and tenure-track faculty members must teach at least one instruction-based (i.e., non-thesis, dissertation, or independent study) course unit equivalent

per academic year.

- a. Exceptions to the minimum instructional load requirement must be approved by the Dean or designee in departmentalized Colleges or by the Senior Vice President and Provost or designee in non-departmentalized Colleges.
 5. Unit workload policies should address whether course releases due to external fellowships, awards, and/or sponsored research (i.e., course buyouts) are permissible and should establish an appropriate buyout standard per course release.
 6. Unit workload policies should address faculty member research and service expectations and consider the intersection of research, teaching, and service activities.
 7. Faculty members are expected to meet workload expectations on an annual basis, but Unit policies may consider averaging faculty workload over a period of time (e.g., three years) in recognition of annual workload fluctuations (e.g., a higher instructional load in one year followed by a reduced instructional load in the next). Unit policies may consider whether course equivalents may accumulate over a period of time (e.g., two or three years).
- G. In the case of joint appointments, assigned faculty workloads in each Unit should be proportional to the assigned FTE in the respective Units. Appointment agreements and/or memoranda of understanding between Units should reflect the assigned faculty member workload in each Unit.
- H. Unit policies must expressly address how workload is rebalanced and/or steps taken when a faculty member:
1. Is assigned and/or engaged in responsibilities or activities that advance the University's mission and operations (e.g., service to a University Unit, University strategic initiatives, curriculum redesign, externally funded research, leadership, or other service);
 2. Expresses a desire to rebalance workload voluntarily (e.g., a faculty member wishes to engage in additional teaching and/or service in lieu of research activity);
or
 3. Is determined under periodic or post-tenure review not to have met Unit expectations in one or more areas of expected performance (e.g., research productivity, teaching, or service).

V. IMPLEMENTATION, OVERSIGHT, AND COMPLIANCE

A. Responsibilities of Unit Heads

1. Each Unit Head is responsible for ensuring that [the](#) faculty workload policy and guidelines are applied equitably, appropriately, and with transparency across the respective Unit.
2. Each Unit Head is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member within the Unit is in compliance with the stated faculty workload policy and guidelines.

B. Responsibilities of the Dean

1. Each Dean is responsible for ensuring that the faculty workload policy and guidelines are applied equitably, appropriately, and with transparency across the Units of the College or School.

C. Review and Approval of Workload Policies

1. Unit workload policies within departmentalized Colleges ~~should~~[must](#) receive the approval of the Dean.
2. Unit workload policies in non-departmentalized Colleges/[or](#) Schools ~~should~~[must](#) be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs for review and approval.
3. The Libraries and Extension workload policies ~~should~~[must](#) receive the approval of the Deans of the Units.
4. Approved workload policies must be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs, which shall maintain a record of all approved workload policies.

D. Responsibilities of the Senior Vice President and Provost

1. The ultimate responsibility for ensuring faculty workload equity and accountability across the University lies with the Senior Vice President and Provost.
2. The Senior Vice President and Provost's Office is responsible for reporting faculty workload information to ~~the~~USM.

E. Unit heads (or designees) in departmentalized Colleges shall prepare [for the Dean](#) an annual summary report of assigned faculty member workloads in their Units ~~for the Dean~~. In non-departmentalized Colleges, the Dean shall prepare the annual report. The report should be made available to all faculty in the Unit, preferably on the Unit's public website, intranet, or online dashboard.

F. Units must develop their initial faculty workload policies, [pursuant to their Unit governance procedures](#), by or before May 23, 2023. Units should review their policies

at a minimum of every five years after initial approval ~~as per~~pursuant to the procedures established in section V.C above.

- G. The Office of Faculty Affairs shall develop, review periodically (at intervals of no more than five years), and publish faculty workload guidance.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

**II-1.25-POLICY ON FACULTY WORKLOAD AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

(Approved by the Board of Regents, August 19, 1994; Amended by the Board of Regents, July 9, 1999; Amended June 21, 2019)

I. Purpose

The purpose of the "USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities" is to promote optimal performance by the University System of Maryland and by each of its institutions in meeting the needs and expectations of its students and other stakeholders, and to provide mechanisms that will ensure public accountability for that performance. Because faculty are the primary performers of the System's teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, the policy should encourage and support faculty in applying their ingenuity, imagination, initiative, knowledge, experience, and professional skills in performing many diverse functions. Faculty are expected to meet their responsibilities independently and in full accord with both institutional expectations, policies, and procedures and established tenets of academic freedom.

This policy acknowledges the essential development of knowledge through research, scholarship, and creative activity and its application to societal needs, while keeping student learning the central focus of our degree-granting institutions. At the same time, this policy and the "USM Guidelines for Reporting Faculty Workload" document provide the flexibility to accommodate our evolving understanding of human learning and recognition of the role faculty play outside the classroom to address the instructional needs of our increasingly diverse student population, including advising, mentoring, and various academic innovation activities.

II. Application

The policy applies to the following individuals:

1. All persons holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty (instructional, research, and public service) and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System;
2. All persons who, while holding faculty rank, are classified as administrators and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and perform their administrative duties at the level of academic department or equivalent academic unit, including chairs, assistant chairs, program director, etc. This policy does not apply to individuals who hold faculty rank but who are assigned to administrative duties outside the department or equivalent academic units, for example, deans, vice presidents, presidents, etc.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

3. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the USM, are classified as instructional faculty, and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System; and
4. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the USM, are classified as research faculty, and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and whose salaries are supported, in whole or in part, by state funds. This policy does not apply to individuals who are classified as research faculty but whose salary is fully supported by non-state funds, e.g., federal research grants.
5. Policies on workload expectations for non-tenured, non-tenure track instructional or research faculty who are employed other than full-time will be established by institutional policy.

III. Institutional Policy

Each institutional president shall establish, in consultation with faculty and academic administrators, and subject to approval by the Chancellor, institution-specific policy and implementation mechanisms consistent with the University System of Maryland's "Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities." Institution-specific policies, including proviso for departmental/school variation, shall include explicit statements of expectations and accountability mechanisms, including the means for comparing faculty performance with workload expectations and reporting the results of such comparisons.

IV. Standard Workload Expectations

Each institution's policy shall include standard expectations for faculty workload. Generally, standard workload expectations will cover teaching, research/ scholarship/creative activity, and service, and shall be consistent with the mission of the institution. However, in order to focus on the centrality of student learning across all USM institutions, workload expectations for each faculty member with respect to teaching shall be assigned in a way that ensures the institution is generating enough credit hours for students to complete their degree requirements in a timely fashion. Additionally, all faculty members, including those with administrative responsibilities at the departmental level, should have a portion of their overall workload dedicated to some aspect of teaching, even if made up only of activities such as mentoring and curriculum development.

The following table provides percentage of load ranges by institution type for standard workload expectations in the areas of teaching, research/ scholarship/creative activity, and service. It is understood that there may be differences across departments, schools, or colleges of an institution, as approved by its president. Additionally, the balance among teaching, research/scholarship/ creative activity, and service for an individual faculty member will likely change over the faculty member's career.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

INSTITUTION TYPE	TEACHING	RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
COMPREHENSIVE % of Total Effort	60-75	15-30	5-20
RESEARCH % of Total Effort	45-55	35-45	5-20
DEGREE-GRANTING RESEARCH CENTER % of Total Effort	5-15	75-85	15-25

In addition to classroom time, teaching effort includes all concomitant activities necessary to the preparation, delivery, and evaluation of teaching and learning, including the various forms of student advising and course/curricular redesign. Research/scholarship/creative activity effort includes but is not limited to discovery research, artistic and creative work, entrepreneurial activity, and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning (integration, application, dissemination, and implementation of innovative pedagogical approaches). Service effort includes but is not limited to contributions to department, school, institution, system, discipline, and/or society more generally through participation in governance processes, evaluation and assessment activities, and/or other activities that benefit students, the institution, and/or the community.

The sum of the "% of total effort" in each area must equal 100% for each individual faculty member. For each faculty member, any substantial difference between the actual and the standard expectation for any basic workload area will be balanced by compensating changes in one or both of the other basic workload areas. Workload expectations for each faculty member should be reviewed annually by the responsible department chair and/or other appropriate administrator in consultation with the faculty member and adjusted as necessary and appropriate.

The institutional faculty reward structure will take into account the workload expectations for each faculty member. Institutions shall develop procedures for the systematic review of faculty, recognize outstanding performance, and establish consequences for failure to fulfill expectations.

V. Variations to Standard Workload Expectations.

All faculty at degree-granting institutions are expected to be involved in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service as previously defined. Recognizing that some faculty will assume new or additional responsibilities in any one of these areas, variations to the standard workload may be made. However, the department is responsible for making the necessary adjustments in the total faculty workload so that departmental expectations in each of these areas are fulfilled. These expectations shall be determined by student enrollments, curricular needs, and accreditation requirements; consistent with the resources available to the department; and approved by the institution's president.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

Variations to the standard workload may be made based on the following considerations:

1. **Teaching.** Variations from the standard teaching load may be based upon a number of factors, including class size; development of new courses; modality of instruction (such as distance education); level of instruction; discipline; accreditation requirements; etc.
2. **Departmental Administration.** Assumption of responsibility for the functions of chair, assistant chair, or program director, or for special departmental projects, may require reduction of expectations for service, research/scholarship/creative activity or instruction. The magnitude of such reduction shall be dependent on the scope of administrative responsibilities and size of the department.
3. **Externally Funded Research and Service Activities.** Assignment of a higher percentage of a faculty member's workload for research or service activities can be supported by external funds, either research or training grants. In these instances, the accompanying reduction of expectations in other areas should mirror the replacement of departmental salary support by externally funded salary support.
4. **Department-Supported Research. (Departmental Research).** Assignment of a higher percentage of a faculty member's workload for research activities supported by the department and consequent reduction of expectations for service or teaching should be related to the institution's mission.
5. **Department-Supported Service, including service to the institution, system, community, discipline.** Assignment of additional time in areas of service and consequent reduction of expectations for research/scholarship/ creative activity or instruction should be directly related to the duration and the extent of the commitment. For example, individual faculty members may be released from the standard expectation in the areas of research/ scholarship/creative activity or instruction in order to make major professional contributions -- e.g., to work in partnership with the public schools or with business or industry.

Each institution's policy shall account for and justify variations to the standard workload expectations. Institutions shall make the minimum number of exceptions necessary for fulfillment of its institutional mission.

VI. Accountability and Reporting

The focus of external accountability to the Regents and to the State for faculty workload will be the institution, not the individual faculty member, and comprise measures of faculty contributions to student success, their disciplines, and the institution.

Each president shall submit annually to the Chancellor an accountability report following the "USM Guidelines for Reporting Faculty Workload" document developed by the University System of Maryland Office in collaboration with the USM's shared governance bodies and stakeholders.

USM GUIDELINES FOR REPORTING FACULTY WORKLOAD
(Accompanies II-1.25 – USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities)

Approved by Board of Regents – June 21, 2019
(Guidelines are amendable without additional Board of Regents approval.)

Pursuant to the “USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities,” this document provides guidelines to the USM institutions for annually accounting and reporting to the Chancellor the extent to which faculty are meeting standard workload expectations with respect to student success, their disciplines, and the institution. These guidelines, which will be reviewed and updated regularly by the University System of Maryland Office in collaboration with the USM’s shared governance bodies and stakeholders, are intended to allow adjustments to the measures reported as the faculty role on our campuses and our ability to capture data on faculty work continues to evolve.

Each year in the spring, the USM Office will provide the system institutions with instructions for reporting faculty contributions to student success, their disciplines, and the institution for the previous academic year. As described below, the focus of external accountability will be the institution, not the individual faculty member.

1. Measures of Faculty Contributions to Student Success: Because student success is the central focus of our degree-granting institutions, the primary measure of institutional accountability will be made up of the following student throughput measures that apply to *all* institutions and that reflect more broadly and inclusively how the work *all* faculty do results in the progress of students through our institutions (by part-time and full-time students):

- credit hours generated,
- enrollments,
- retention,
- persistence,
- completion,
- and time-to-completion rates.

In addition to the quantitative measures of student throughput, the institutions will also be held accountable for metrics that provide an indication of the quality of faculty-student interactions. These could include but are not limited to: advisement and mentoring; supervision of fieldwork and other off-campus activities (e.g. civic engagement and community-based learning); supervision of creative activity (performances, arts); curricular, program, and course development; and academic innovation activities (new pedagogical approaches, use of technology, development of open educational resources).

2. Measures of Faculty Contributions to their Discipline: While measures that account for faculty role in student success make up the basis of the report, the reputation of USM institutions is also built on the contributions faculty make to their disciplines locally, nationally, and internationally. So, in addition to instructional and student success activities, documenting faculty contributions to the research/scholarship/creative activity of their disciplines, the

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

reputation and financial resources of their institutions through funded projects, and the economic success of the state through entrepreneurial activity are also critical measures of faculty work.

These could include but are not limited to: amount of external funding; number of books published; number of refereed publications; number of non-refereed publications; participation in professional presentations; participation in creative activities; leadership of professional organizations; editorial and national reviewing activities; awards; entrepreneurial activities (company start-ups, patents, licenses).

3. Measures of Faculty Contributions to the Institution and the System: No institution or state system of higher education can be successful without the engagement of faculty in service and administrative roles. Documenting faculty contributions in supporting the institutional/system infrastructure is also an important part of our accountability to the Regents and the State.

These could include but are not limited to: service to institution (committees); academic administration assignments (course director, supervisory roles, review of adjuncts); peer mentoring and leadership development; support of more non-traditional and new platforms for teaching; days in public service to business, government, schools, and non-profit organizations; compliance / accreditation and assessment.



BOARD OF REGENTS

SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION,
INFORMATION, OR DISCUSSION

TOPIC: Amendments to USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-I.25)

COMMITTEE: Education Policy and Student Life

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: Tuesday, May 7, 2019

SUMMARY: The Committee is asked to review and approve revisions to the USM’s *Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-I.25)*. The main purpose of this policy is to promote optimal performance by the USM institutions in meeting the needs and expectations of its students and other stakeholders and to provide mechanisms that will ensure public accountability for that performance, particularly as it relates to faculty work. The USM’s current faculty workload reporting and policies were initially adopted in 1994, amended in 1999 and then again in 2003-2004 as part of the USM Effectiveness and Efficiency process. The basic units of work, data collection, and the reporting outputs have remained largely unchanged throughout this period. This stability has helped advance the public perception of the policy as a strong accountability tool and enabled USM and state oversight agencies to compare data over time.

However, as the nature of faculty work has evolved since 1994, the current reporting process has developed a number of issues --most of these resulting from the reporting requirements’ rigidity. It is becoming increasingly clear that, not only has the current emphasis on measuring and equating all “teaching” activities to 3-credit hour course units become outdated, but it is also becoming constraining for faculty, departments, and institutions attempting to engage in various academic innovations. With these issues in mind, the Faculty Workload Workgroup is recommending changes to the policy to improve accuracy and coverage, align with current practice, and incentivize policy goals around academic innovation and student success. At this meeting we will review specific changes made and request committee approval of the revised policy and the associated guidelines.

ALTERNATIVE(S): The regents may not approve the amendments, may make recommendations, or may ask for additional information.

FISCAL IMPACT: There is no fiscal impact associated with these proposed amendments.

CHANCELLOR’S RECOMMENDATION: That the Education Policy and Student Life Committee recommend that the Board of Regents approve the proposed amendments to and guidelines accompanying the USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-I.25).

COMMITTEE ACTION: Approval

DATE: May 7, 2019

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Joann A. Boughman

301-445-1992

jboughman@usmd.edu

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents



II-1.25-POLICY ON FACULTY WORKLOAD AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(Approved by the Board of Regents, August 19, 1994; Amended by the Board of Regents, July 9, 1999; Revised XXXXX)

I. Purpose

The purpose of the "USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities" is to promote optimal performance by the University System of Maryland and by each of its institutions in meeting the needs and expectations of its students and other stakeholders, and to provide mechanisms that will ensure public accountability for that performance. Because faculty are the primary performers of the System's teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, the policy should encourage and support faculty in applying their ingenuity, imagination, initiative, knowledge, experience, and professional skills in performing many diverse functions. Faculty are expected to meet their responsibilities independently and in full accord with both institutional expectations, policies, and procedures and established tenets of academic freedom.

This policy acknowledges the essential development of knowledge through research, scholarship, and creative activity and its application to societal needs, while keeping student learning the central focus of our degree-granting institutions. At the same time, this policy and the "USM Guidelines for Reporting Faculty Workload" document provide the flexibility to accommodate our evolving understanding of human learning and recognition of the role faculty play outside the classroom to address the instructional needs of our increasingly diverse student population, including advising, mentoring, and various academic innovation activities.

II. Application

The policy applies to the following individuals:

1. All persons holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty (instructional, research, and public service) and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System;
2. All persons who, while holding faculty rank, are classified as administrators and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and perform their administrative duties at the level of academic department or equivalent academic unit, including chairs, assistant chairs, program director, etc. This policy does not apply to individuals who hold faculty rank but who are assigned to administrative duties outside the department or equivalent academic units, for example, deans, vice presidents, presidents, etc.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

3. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the USM, are classified as instructional faculty, and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System; and

4. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the USM, are classified as research faculty, and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and whose salaries are supported, in whole or in part, by state funds. This policy does not apply to individuals who are classified as research faculty but whose salary is fully supported by non-state funds, e.g., federal research grants.

5. Policies on workload expectations for non-tenured, non-tenure track instructional or research faculty who are employed other than full-time will be established by institutional policy.

III. Institutional Policy

Each institutional president shall establish, in consultation with faculty and academic administrators, and subject to approval by the Chancellor, institution-specific policy and implementation mechanisms consistent with the University System of Maryland's "Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities." Institution-specific policies, including proviso for departmental/school variation, shall include explicit statements of expectations and accountability mechanisms, including the means for comparing faculty performance with workload expectations and reporting the results of such comparisons.

IV. Standard Workload Expectations

Each institution's policy shall include standard expectations for faculty workload. Generally, standard workload expectations will cover teaching, research/ scholarship/creative activity, and service, and shall be consistent with the mission of the institution. However, in order to focus on the centrality of student learning across all USM institutions, workload expectations for each faculty member with respect to teaching shall be assigned in a way that ensures the institution is generating enough credit hours for students to complete their degree requirements in a timely fashion. Additionally, all faculty members, including those with administrative responsibilities at the departmental level, should have a portion of their overall workload dedicated to some aspect of teaching, even if made up only of activities such as mentoring and curriculum development.

The following table provides percentage of load ranges by institution type for standard workload expectations in the areas of teaching, research/ scholarship/creative activity, and service. It is understood that there may be differences across departments, schools, or colleges of an institution, as approved by its president. Additionally, the balance among teaching, research/scholarship/ creative activity, and service for an individual faculty member will likely change over the faculty member's career.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

INSTITUTION TYPE	TEACHING	RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
COMPREHENSIVE % of Total Effort	60-75	15-30	5-20
RESEARCH % of Total Effort	45-55	35-45	5-20
DEGREE-GRANTING RESEARCH CENTER % of Total Effort	5-15	75-85	15-25

In addition to classroom time, teaching effort includes all concomitant activities necessary to the preparation, delivery, and evaluation of teaching and learning, including the various forms of student advising and course/curricular redesign. Research/scholarship/creative activity effort includes but is not limited to discovery research, artistic and creative work, entrepreneurial activity, and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning (integration, application, dissemination, and implementation of innovative pedagogical approaches). Service effort includes but is not limited to contributions to department, school, institution, system, discipline, and/or society more generally through participation in governance processes, evaluation and assessment activities, and/or other activities that benefit students, the institution, and/or the community.

The sum of the "% of total effort" in each area must equal 100% for each individual faculty member. For each faculty member, any substantial difference between the actual and the standard expectation for any basic workload area will be balanced by compensating changes in one or both of the other basic workload areas. Workload expectations for each faculty member should be reviewed annually by the responsible department chair and/or other appropriate administrator in consultation with the faculty member and adjusted as necessary and appropriate.

The institutional faculty reward structure will take into account the workload expectations for each faculty member. Institutions shall develop procedures for the systematic review of faculty, recognize outstanding performance, and establish consequences for failure to fulfill expectations.

V. Variations to Standard Workload Expectations.

All faculty at degree-granting institutions are expected to be involved in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service as previously defined. Recognizing that some faculty will assume new or additional responsibilities in any one of these areas, variations to the standard workload may be made. However, the department is responsible for making the necessary adjustments in the total faculty workload so that departmental expectations in each of these areas are fulfilled. These expectations shall be determined by student enrollments, curricular needs, and accreditation requirements; consistent with the resources available to the department; and approved by the institution's president.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

Variations to the standard workload may be made based on the following considerations:

1. **Teaching.** Variations from the standard teaching load may be based upon a number of factors, including class size; development of new courses; modality of instruction (such as distance education); level of instruction; discipline; accreditation requirements; etc.
2. **Departmental Administration.** Assumption of responsibility for the functions of chair, assistant chair, or program director, or for special departmental projects, may require reduction of expectations for service, research/scholarship/creative activity or instruction. The magnitude of such reduction shall be dependent on the scope of administrative responsibilities and size of the department.
3. **Externally Funded Research and Service Activities.** Assignment of a higher percentage of a faculty member's workload for research or service activities can be supported by external funds, either research or training grants. In these instances, the accompanying reduction of expectations in other areas should mirror the replacement of departmental salary support by externally funded salary support.
4. **Department-Supported Research. (Departmental Research).** Assignment of a higher percentage of a faculty member's workload for research activities supported by the department and consequent reduction of expectations for service or teaching should be related to the institution's mission.
5. **Department-Supported Service, including service to the institution, system, community, discipline.** Assignment of additional time in areas of service and consequent reduction of expectations for research/scholarship/ creative activity or instruction should be directly related to the duration and the extent of the commitment. For example, individual faculty members may be released from the standard expectation in the areas of research/ scholarship/creative activity or instruction in order to make major professional contributions -- e.g., to work in partnership with the public schools or with business or industry.

Each institution's policy shall account for and justify variations to the standard workload expectations. Institutions shall make the minimum number of exceptions necessary for fulfillment of its institutional mission.

VI. Accountability and Reporting

The focus of external accountability to the Regents and to the State for faculty workload will be the institution, not the individual faculty member, and comprise measures of faculty contributions to student success, their disciplines, and the institution.

Each president shall submit annually to the Chancellor an accountability report following the "USM Guidelines for Reporting Faculty Workload" document developed by the University System of Maryland Office in collaboration with the USM's shared governance bodies and stakeholders.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

USM GUIDELINES FOR REPORTING FACULTY WORKLOAD

DRAFT May 1, 2019

Pursuant to the “USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities,” this document provides guidelines to the USM institutions for annually accounting and reporting to the Chancellor the extent to which faculty are meeting standard workload expectations with respect to student success, their disciplines, and the institution. These guidelines, which will be reviewed and updated regularly by the University System of Maryland Office in collaboration with the USM’s shared governance bodies and stakeholders, are intended to allow adjustments to the measures reported as the faculty role on our campuses and our ability to capture data on faculty work continues to evolve.

Each year in the spring, the USM Office will provide the system institutions with instructions for reporting faculty contributions to student success, their disciplines, and the institution for the previous academic year. As described below, the focus of external accountability will be the institution, not the individual faculty member.

1. Measures of Faculty Contributions to Student Success: Because student success is the central focus of our degree-granting institutions, the primary measure of institutional accountability will be made up of the following student throughput measures that apply to *all* institutions and that reflect more broadly and inclusively how the work *all* faculty do results in the progress of students through our institutions (by part-time and full-time students):

- credit hours generated,
- enrollments,
- retention,
- persistence,
- completion,
- and time-to-completion rates.

In addition to the quantitative measures of student throughput, the institutions will also be held accountable for metrics that provide an indication of the quality of faculty-student interactions. These could include but are not limited to: advisement and mentoring; supervision of fieldwork and other off-campus activities (e.g. civic engagement and community-based learning); supervision of creative activity (performances, arts); curricular, program, and course development; and academic innovation activities (new pedagogical approaches, use of technology, development of open educational resources).

2. Measures of Faculty Contributions to their Discipline: While measures that account for faculty role in student success make up the basis of the report, the reputation of USM institutions is also built on the contributions faculty make to their disciplines locally, nationally, and internationally. So, in addition to instructional and student success activities, documenting faculty contributions to the research/scholarship/creative activity of their disciplines, the reputation and financial resources of their institutions through funded projects, and the economic success of the state through entrepreneurial activity are also critical measures of faculty work.

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents

These could include but are not limited to: amount of external funding; number of books published; number of refereed publications; number of non-refereed publications; participation in professional presentations; participation in creative activities; leadership of professional organizations; editorial and national reviewing activities; awards; entrepreneurial activities (company start-ups, patents, licenses).

3. Measures of Faculty Contributions to the Institution and the System: No institution or state system of higher education can be successful without the engagement of faculty in service and administrative roles. Documenting faculty contributions in supporting the institutional/system infrastructure is also an important part of our accountability to the Regents and the State.

These could include but are not limited to: service to institution (committees); academic administration assignments (course director, supervisory roles, review of adjuncts); peer mentoring and leadership development; support of more non-traditional and new platforms for teaching; days in public service to business, government, schools, and non-profit organizations; compliance / accreditation and assessment.



Review of the University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (Senate Document #22-23-12) Faculty Affairs Committee | Chair: Peter Sunderland

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Newman request that the Faculty Affairs Committee review the Interim University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25[A]).

The Faculty Affairs Committee should:

1. Review the University System of Maryland (USM) Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities ([II-1.25](#)).
2. Review the interim University of Maryland Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities ([II-1.25\[A\]](#)).
3. Review the draft faculty workload guidance developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
4. Review faculty workload policies and any data or best practices associated with implementation at other USM institutions prepared by the Provost's Working Group.
5. Consult with representatives of the Provost's Working Group regarding the development of the interim policy and related considerations.
6. Consult with a representative(s) of the Office of Faculty Affairs, to include consultation regarding the use of Faculty Success as a data source for faculty workload processes.
7. Consult with a representative from the Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) regarding faculty workload reporting to USM.
8. Consult with a representative of the ADVANCE program and campus subject matter experts regarding faculty workload and equity and fairness considerations.
9. Consult with a representative group of Academic and Research Unit Heads, as appropriate, regarding their development and implementation of unit faculty workload policies.
10. Comment on the draft faculty workload guidance developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
11. Consider the implications and impact of the policy on Academic and Research Units.
12. Consider the implications of the policy for delivering remote learning.
13. Consult with the Office of General Counsel on any proposed revisions to the interim University Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25(A)).
14. If appropriate, recommend whether the interim University Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload and Responsibilities (II-1.25 [A]) should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **March 7, 2023**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact the Senate Office at senate-admin@umd.edu.