

Blue Ribbon Workload Working Group

DRAFT - Final Report

February 19, 2003

Prepared by: Laurie Brewer
Peter Lalley
Tom Raco
Al Smith
Gus Thompson

Charge

The working group was charged to develop reporting protocols to fully implement the current college and center workload guidelines. The reporting protocols will enable the Dean to review workloads quarterly and annually and make determinations of what open positions will be filled, eliminated, or reallocated. This data will also be provided to department chairs for their information and use in managing their resources.

Process/Activities

The working group reviewed the college and center workload guidelines, the Blue Ribbon Recommendations from the Dean and VP, and the principles for workload recommended by the Blue Ribbon Final Report: Direct Instruction and Applied Research. We have divided the report into primary area of responsibility as follows:

Primary Areas of Responsibility

I. a. Faculty Whose Primary Area of Responsibility is Direct Classroom Instruction

We confirmed that we would develop reporting protocol that is based on the current college and center workload guidelines. For classroom instruction we followed the principles outlined in Appendix B of the Blue Ribbon Report (see Attachment 1) and reaffirmed the following:

1. Use annual classroom contact hours and staff for annual averages. In the past, practice in some instruction areas was to use Fall Quarter data when demand is highest. This resulted in staffing for peak demand. Given budget reductions we need to staff for average annual demand and supplement with adjunct instruction to meet peak demand.
2. For faculty teaching credit-bearing courses, we would use existing instructional data that could be generated from STARS: including number of sections taught, number of contact hours reported, department's number of students per section, credit hours generated.
3. Summary data will be presented in a simple, easy to interpret format, very similar to the format in the Blue Ribbon Recommendations. Summary workload averages by department will be presented on a quarterly basis and will be accumulated into annual averages.

We also clarified the principles in the Blue Ribbon Report in the following ways.

1. We subtracted from the FTE assigned to the department, the FTE of Chair and the FTE associated with any institute special assignments identified by the Dean's Office when calculating departmental averages.
2. We agreed to the following definition of contact hours and the expected contact hours per week in each center:

For faculty teaching credit bearing courses, we agreed to count those hours, which can be extracted from STARS as the class contact hours in each center. This will include scheduled lecture and lab hours for credit bearing courses. It will not include NLC hours, unscheduled lab hours, or required or voluntary tutoring hours associated with normal teaching assignments. The contact hour ranges to be used are as follows:

CAS

Teaching classroom/lecture contact hours per week = 12-16

CTS

Teaching straight class/lecture contact hours per week = 12

Teaching combination of lecture/lab contact hours per week = 15

Other important factors to track:

1. average class size (including % to maximum utilization)
2. average number of sections
3. average credit hours supported or generated

We followed the Blue Ribbon Report and developed two perspectives for summarizing each teaching department's workload output:

1. Total instructional output of the resident department faculty, as a part of their approved POW, regardless of where they taught the course (Individual Analysis).
2. Total instructional output needed to deliver the department's curriculum (Department Analysis).

We agreed that for the purpose of determining when to refill an open position in CAS and CTS, the focus should be on the primary area of responsibility, which is classroom instruction.

I. b. For Faculty in CBGS Whose Primary Area of Responsibility is Instruction (Classroom and Tutoring):

Instructional responsibilities can consist of direct classroom instruction, tutoring, or a combination of direct classroom instruction and tutoring.

1. Instructors in courses taught in the College of Liberal Arts teach two course/sections per quarter with 20 students in each section, or 40 students per quarter. Instructors in writing courses teach two course/sections per quarter with 15 students in each class, or 30 students per quarter. As part of their instructional responsibilities each instructor is required to provide student conferences on a weekly basis. The weekly workload expectation for direct instruction is 8 contact hours.
2. Faculty whose primary area of responsibility is tutoring in the support departments is expected to develop and maintain expertise in a great number and variety of courses. Each faculty member is expected to provide 14-16 contact hours of tutoring per week.
3. Faculty whose POW includes both direct classroom instruction and tutoring is expected to have an average of 18-20 students per section. In combination with tutoring students in other courses the total contact hours should be 14-16 contact hours per week.
4. All support faculty, in addition to direct classroom instruction or tutoring, are expected to provide additional contact hours in academic advising and liaison activities to bring the total contact hours to 22-26 per week.

We agreed that for the purpose of determining when to refill an open position in CBGS the focus should be on the primary area of responsibility, which is instruction (classroom teaching and tutoring).

II. Faculty whose Primary Area of Responsibility is Other Than Classroom Instruction:

For those faculty positions that have tutoring, research, speech and language, audiology or counseling, as their primary area of responsibility there is no existing institutional data available. Consequently, we determined that we will need to collect self-reported data in order to give the dean a complete picture of faculty workload at NTID. In collaboration with the chairs of the respective departments we developed forms to reflect the primary job functions of faculty in the areas described above. These forms will be used to collect data from each faculty member, and will be summarized by the chairs. Again, the focus for the purpose of refilling open positions is the FTE required to deliver the primary function of the position. As is the case for all departments with faculty, the Dean will receive the summary data, and the individual data.

Research

As we did with instructional faculty, we confirmed that for Research we would develop a reporting protocol that is based on the current college and center workload guidelines, as well as the principles outlined in the Blue Ribbon Decisions memorandum to the NTID Community dated October 10, 2002 and the original Blue Ribbon Study Team Report on Direct Instruction and Applied Research Model and affirmed the following:

1. Programmatic Research in support of institutional priorities will be the primary responsibility of Research faculty and will represent the majority of a researcher's plan of work.
2. Teaching will be an integral part of a researcher's plan of work, instead of institutional research. Appendix C of the Blue Ribbon Recommendations, page 35 states that the higher the teaching expectation the more it would serve to ameliorate the impact of the reductions in overall teaching faculty (in CAS and CTS), foster better cross-utilization of resources and inform and enrich programmatic research (see Attachment 1). In addition, the RIT President published a white paper that specifies that research faculty at RIT should have a teaching expectation that is no less than 3 course per year. Therefore, NTID research faculty should endeavor to meet their current teaching expectation of 2 courses per year and should plan on preparing themselves for 3 courses in the next year or so.

The workload form developed for research faculty includes information related to programmatic research such as projects assigned, projects completed, presentations made, publications, grants applied for and grants awarded. In addition, it includes classroom teaching, and tutoring/mentoring. This information will be collected quarterly for each research faculty member, summarized by the chair of the department and shared with the dean.

We agreed that for the purpose of determining when to refill an open position in Research the focus should be on the primary area of responsibility, which is research.

Speech-Language and Audiology

As we did with instructional faculty, we confirmed that for Speech-Language and Audiology we would develop a reporting protocol that is based on the current college and center workload guidelines, as well as the principles outlined in the Blue Ribbon Decisions memorandum to the NTID Community dated October 10, 2002 and the original Blue Ribbon Study Team Report on Student Services and The Strategic Plan: An Agenda for Action, 1992 and affirmed the following:

1. Clinical Services will be the primary responsibility of Speech-Language and Audiology and should represent the majority of a speech-language and audiology faculty member's plan of work.

2. While classroom instruction is a highly valued activity of an NTID faculty member, the instructional responsibilities of Speech and Language and Audiology faculty is under review per the Blue Ribbon Recommendation.

The workload form developed for speech-language and audiology faculty includes information related to clinical service such as different students served, hours of service scheduled, walk-in hours of service provided, and actual service provided. In addition, it includes classroom teaching, both credit bearing and non-credit bearing. Lastly, it includes workshops and other activity. This information will be collected quarterly for each faculty member, summarized by the chair of the department and shared with the dean.

We agreed that for the purpose of determining when to refill an open position in Speech and Language and Audiology the focus should be on the primary area of responsibility, which is clinical services.

Counseling

As we did with instructional faculty, we confirmed that for Counseling we would develop a reporting protocol that is based on the current college and center workload guidelines, as well as the principles outlined in the Blue Ribbon Decisions memorandum to the NTID Community dated October 10, 2002 and the original Blue Ribbon Study Team Report on Student Services and affirmed the following:

1. Academic, career and personal advisement will be the primary responsibility of counseling faculty and should represent the majority of a counseling faculty member's plan of work.
2. While classroom instruction is a highly valued activity of an NTID faculty member, the focus for counseling faculty should be Freshman Seminar and Career Decision Making as they are viewed as integral parts of the advisement process. Counselors should continue to be the primary providers of such instruction

The workload form developed for counseling faculty includes information related to academic, career and personal advisement such as caseload, different students served, and actual contact hours of advisement provided. In addition, it includes classroom teaching and hours of consultations with other professionals in problem resolution for students. This information will be collected quarterly for each faculty member, summarized by the chair of the department and shared with the dean.

We agreed that for the purpose of determining when to refill an open position in Counseling the focus should be on the primary area of responsibility, which is counseling services.

Data Collection Process

A. See Attachment 2 for copies of all data collection forms

1. CAS/CTS faculty
2. Support faculty
3. Research faculty
4. Speech and Language and Audiology faculty
5. Counseling Faculty

B. Data Verification Process

Chairs will have an opportunity to review individualized workload data from STARS and self-reported data *before* it is summarized and sent to the dean. The chair, in collaboration with their center director/associate dean will verify the accuracy of the data, notify the Institutional Research Office of any discrepancies, and will work with IR to rectify. Final individual and summary data sent to the dean will be copied to center directors/associate deans and respective chairs. **Paid overload and/or adjunct work will not be included in the individual faculty members workload.**

C. Application of the Workload Data

When a chair has an open position he/she will review the workload data with the center director/associate dean to determine if there is sufficient evidence to justify making a request to the dean to refill the position. If the decision is to make a request then the request and rationale are submitted to the dean for review and approval. In developing the rationale the chair and the center director/associate dean will offer their interpretation of the data, including the impact of grant assignments, coordinator roles, other special assignments, etc. The decision to fill, reallocate or eliminate the position will be made by the dean after consultation with the center director/associate dean and respective chair.

D. Ongoing Issues

In designing these forms there were some recurring themes that need attention. Within departments, across departments and across centers, there are many variables which affect how workload is assigned. In this time of budget reduction, it is important to focus on what resources are required to deliver the primary function of the position. This may require the reduction or elimination of certain functions that are ancillary to the primary area of responsibility of faculty.

In the primary area of teaching there is a constant interplay of the number of sections taught, number of different preps, number of contact hours, and number of students served. Judgment is required in deciding what are comparable workloads. For example, are two sections of 8 contact hours with 30 students the same as three sections at 12 contact hours serving 30 students comparable?

We also noticed that departments assign teaching loads to part-time and full-time visiting faculty differently. Some departments assign part-time faculty a proportionate reduction in teaching load and assign full-time visiting faculty teaching loads equivalent to the loads carried by tenure-track faculty even though their position have no contractual obligations for professional activities or service to the institute. Other departments assign the equivalent of 120% of a workload to visiting and part time faculty, but do not include other expectations in their POW (e.g. committee work, advanced degrees, professional activities). Expecting greater instructional efficiency from these faculty categories may enhance our ability to meet the teaching needs of the college, but this would have to be consistently implemented.

Independent study assignments are not always consistently reported in STARS. Some have contact hours associated with them and others do not. We need to have a common understanding of how to include and account for independent study, and consistently follow RIT guidelines in this area.

Attachment 1

Blue Ribbon Final Report Appendices

- 1. Instructional Guidelines**
- 2. Proposed Research and Teaching Models**

Instructional Guidelines

Goal: All academic departments will assign classroom teaching based upon the Center and Institute guidelines. At a minimum, the assignments will result in department classroom contact hour averages (for the full year) that will fall **within** the range specified in the Center guidelines. In addition, section sizes will be maximized where possible.

Guiding Principles:

1. Common information is the basis of consensual decision-making and its resources should draw only on existing institutional data.¹
2. The data should be simple to produce and interpret. For resource decisions, the dean will continue to review individual explanations from each department regarding special assignments and considerations while being guided by the data.
3. Typically, the midpoint of the contact hour guidelines per Center would be an appropriate target. However, the committee has chosen the minimum of the ranges to give departments some flexibility in dealing with LOAs and special assignments. The minimum contact hours per week per faculty member guidelines (in most cases 12 for lectures and 14 for lab/studio) was chosen so that departments with special arrangements will not be overly burdened by the immediate application of previously ratified Center/Institute guidelines. However, overload will not apply until the range maximums have been exceeded.²
 - a. Section sizes should be **at least** 50% of capacity or greater. Section sizes less than 50% will be kept at a bare minimum, and in most cases cancelled. Section sizes by department should **average** 75% of capacity or greater.
 - b. Section size should be taken into account. This can be done by producing a statistic that can be labeled as “student contact hours generated” (annual contact hours taught multiplied by the annual average number of students per class). A reasonable department standard should be (annual contact hour (36 or 42) expectation multiplied by 75% of established average class size maximum). Actual department averages can then be compared to the department standard.
 - c. Requests to replace headcount will be entertained only if all the above departmental benchmarks have been met or exceeded during the previous three quarters: contact hours per week, student contact hours generated, and percent of section capacity.

Operating Principles:

The calculations will be simple and straightforward.

- The numerators will be total contact hours and student contact hours generated by the department faculty and chair exclusive of overload, adjuncts and faculty and staff from other departments.
- The denominator will be all faculty in the department (except the chair)³ on an FTE basis.
- Special assignments such as coordinators, assistant chairpersons, or special project assignments will not be taken into consideration.
- Each section has an established capacity in the registration system. The number of students enrolled in the section as of the 21-day report will be divided by the capacity to arrive at the percent of capacity figure.
- Compliance with this standard will be measured over a one-year period, so that a shortfall in one quarter can be made up in the other two quarters.

¹ A methodology will be developed to routinely capture non-credit individual tutoring hours for support departments in a central database.

² The instructional workload standard for faculty teaching only in lecture format is 12-16 contact hours per faculty member per week per quarter, while the standard for faculty with a lab/studio only is 14-18 contact hours per week, and a mix of lecture and lab is 12 – 15 contact hours.

³ Current guidelines call for the chair to spend 20-25% of his or her time in the classroom. In the calculation of departmental averages, the teaching FTE of the chair will not be part of the denominator, but any contact hours taught by them will be counted in the department total output. This is intended to give as much flexibility for special assignments and LOAs as possible.

Proposed Research and Teaching Models

The committee recommends that the current models of research and teaching continue to be modified in the direction already set by the college. This means that NTID would maintain research faculty positions for which the primary area of responsibility is programmatic research as defined by the college complemented by classroom teaching, and we would maintain teaching faculty positions for which the primary responsibility is teaching complemented by scholarship. The question as we move into the future is what should the balance of teaching and research/scholarship be for these two types of positions in order to meet the college's primary and secondary missions in the most cost effective manner?

The following areas of innovation should be studied immediately and considered for implementation. The primary goal of the innovations is to strengthen both the teaching and the research that occurs at NTID by acknowledging that applied research at NTID needs to be informed and enriched by the practice of teaching deaf and hard of hearing students, and that teaching at NTID needs to be informed and enriched by the latest research and most current technology. At the same time, the college recognizes that individual faculty members tend to be more talented and productive in one of these areas, which supports maintaining faculty positions with different expectations for research and teaching. By not having faculty exclusively devoted to either teaching or research, the college will have greater flexibility to adjust faculty plans of work depending on the changing demand for teaching and the funds available for research.

1. Hiring

Research faculty should be hired based on their research skills in areas of programmatic research identified by the college and for their ability to teach in specific areas of the curriculum. Over time, this could provide additional resources for teaching in CBGS (including MSSE), CTS and CAS and provide more researchers with the opportunity for their programmatic research to be directly informed and enriched by their experiences teaching deaf and hard of hearing students.

Teaching faculty should be hired based on their ability to provide instruction in specific areas of the curriculum and their ability to contribute to the scholarship of teaching, discovery, integration or application as described in the RIT definition of scholarship. Over time, this should increase the opportunity for curriculum development and instruction to be directly informed by faculty's scholarship and increase the opportunity of teaching faculty to contribute to research.

2. Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty need time and resources in order to be actively engaged in scholarship including staying current in advances in technology. Several strategies could be pursued.

Identify 2 of the positions that become open in research in the next five years to be held open in CRTL. Use the funds from these open positions to support teaching faculty spending 1-3 quarters in CRTL working on scholarship.

When faculty apply for research grants, require them to include funds to hire adjuncts to cover part or all of their teaching loads.

Continue to encourage teaching and research faculty to collaborate on research and the scholarship of teaching.

5. Outsourcing

The committee recommends that the college continue to look for efficiencies in conducting research through outsourcing. For example, it has proved more cost effective and faster to have workforce and marketability research for new technical program development conducted by contracting externally with companies who specialize in this type of research. We should continue to focus our research efforts as defined by our secondary mission (enhancement of the social, economic and the educational accommodation of deaf people) and look for opportunities to utilize the expertise of others in areas related, but not central to our mission.

Future Opportunities for Additional Cost Savings/ Reallocation /or Enhancement of Teaching Resource

The research department houses some of our finest scholars. We should make every effort to shape and utilize these valuable resources in ways that serve the highest priorities of the institute. NTID will benefit and so will the individual researcher.

We have recommended increased involvement of researchers in the teaching mission of NTID to better inform their programmatic research. With the reductions in the number of faculty in CAS and CTS and the prospect of increasing the MSSE program from 30 to 60 students, it may become of paramount importance to engage researchers more in the classroom. If over the next five years, two positions in CRTL were eliminated or reallocated and the model for institute research changed, 14 FTE would remain devoted to programmatic research and teaching. If each faculty member taught two courses a year, that would equate to 28 sections per year; if each research faculty taught 3 courses a year, that would equate to 42 sections per year. The higher the teaching expectation the more it would serve to minimize the impact of the reductions in overall teaching faculty, foster better cross-utilization of resources and inform and enrich programmatic research.