R·I·T

Rochester Institute of Technology

To: NTID Faculty

From: Jim DeCaro
Date: April 4, 1997
Subject: Final Workload Guidelines for NTID

Attached is the final approved faculty workload guidelines for NTID that you first reviewed in Fall 1996 and reviewed again in February 1997. I received 12 pieces -+ feedback on the last draft and consequently you will see very little change.

These guidelines stipulate that each center will develop its own internal workload document. Center documents will explain how these college guidelines are applied within a center context. I expect the center documents to be ready for my review and approval by June 15, 1997.

Thanks for your help and good counsel during this process. The guidelines were strengthened significantly by the considerable discussion that occurred around this topic. I now look forward to reviewing each center document. It is my expectation and that of Dr. Davila and Dr. McKenzie that we will begin implementation of these guidelines in the next academic year.

Att.

cc: Dr. Stanley McKenzie
        Dr. Robert Davila
        NTID Faculty Congress Executive Committee

NTID Faculty Workload Guidelines

Background

Recent efforts of NTID faculty and administration to review faculty workload guidelines are the direct result of internal and external pressure to revisit underlying workload assumptions in light of specific concerns raised related to workload equity, productivity, and resource deployment.

NTID's Strategic Plan (1992) recognized the importance of establishing an organizational structure and infrastructure that would advance our college's ability to meet "critical organizational objectives of collaboration, joint decision making and programmatic integration" (p. 75). As a new center structure took shape, the issue of equitable workload within and across centers was called into question. Specific concerns were voiced principally in organizational units where faculty from former schools/divisions (each bringing different previous workloads with them) were for the first time affiliated and working side by side within a new organizational framework. The variance in workload caused associated questions about "fairness" and "equity" to be raised by faculty and chairs with center directors. In addition, NTID's Faculty Council Executive Committee brought similar issues to the table in discussions with the Dean early in 1995. The Dean made a commitment at that time to examine these issues and subsequently placed workload analyses on the institutional agenda.

Concurrently, the Department of Education in 1995 initiated discussions with NTID about productivity indicators and workload standards, particularly as they impact staffing levels and ongoing budget requirements. In response, NTID developed key indicator data and committed to develop workload guidelines that would serve as one of the underlying assumptions for future federal appropriation requests. During the same time period that such discussions were occurring at the federal level, RIT Provost McKenzie initiated deliberations at the Deans Council about university goals for increasing productivity. The Provost is currently in the process of establishing a target for each college with the exception of NTID. It was agreed by the Provost that NTID's workload

guidelines would be the approach taken by our college to respond to the university goals for increasing productivity.

With these imperatives in mind, the Dean focused institutional attention on faculty workload and asked each center director to coordinate center efforts around this topic during the 1995-1996 academic year.

As a result, discussions ensued in each center related to faculty workload. Each center director worked with center constituent groups to formulate a center recommendation on workload. Recommended center guidelines were discussed at a June 1996 leadership retreat. Following these deliberations, the Dean requested further discussion occur in order to arrive at a framework that would have relevance, common elements and support across all centers. The center directors worked together over the summer to prepare a college workload document that could be shared with the community in the Fall. This document was distributed on September 15, 1996. Following distribution, considerable center dialogue and feedback occurred.

Thoughtful commentary from faculty on the first draft suggested that significant changes were warranted and that college guidelines should be general in nature, thus allowing each center to use the college guidelines as a framework for a much more detailed center-specific document. The center document will detail and explain applications of the college guidelines within center-specific situations.

It is with this understanding and objective in mind that the following revised college guidelines are presented.

Workload Concepts

In formulating a framework for college workload, we recognize that faculty are members of multiple cultures, each having its own set of formative expectations about time and activity' patterns. For example, faculty are members of a college, a department, an area of specialization, in some cases a subdiscipline and other collegial groups. Perspectives about time within and across these affiliations are not always consistent. And, even when they are, partitioning and sequencing activities for the purpose of defining workload can be problematic. We also recognize that there is strong resistance, understandably so, to the notion of describing professional work using references to the number of average weekly hours worked. Even though many national studies take this approach, we realize that the important issue here is not the hours worked but getting the job done in a quality way. For practical purposes, however, most workload models do define major areas of professional responsibilities, outline parameters for expected allocation of effort among such activities and ascribe some numerical measure or value in the definition of a full-time load. In most cases this takes the form of a specified credit or contact hour load.

Initially, we looked for guidance from institutions[1] with which we historically have compared ourselves for salary purposes and also studied the workload models within other RIT colleges[2]. While helpful, none of these comparison units share our unique mission, culture or pedagogical traditions. This made it difficult to make any direct transference to our setting.

Given the special nature of the work that our faculty engage in, and our desire to introduce reasonable flexibility into a workload formula, our framework is focused on underlying principles, suggested operational components and relevant factors affecting individual workload variance. We have tried to develop guidelines which can be easily understood, allow considerable flexibility, can reasonably be applied on a center-by-center basis and enable us to meet student demand for courses and services in an educationally and fiscally responsible manner.

---

[1]These included: Gallaudet University, Erie Community College, Onondaga Community College; Monroe Community College, Suffolk Community College, and Nassau Community College.

[2]These included workload information from RIT's Colleges of Business, Science, Liberal Arts, Applied Science and Technology, and Imaging Arts and Science.

A. Underlying Principles

To that end, our recommended model is guided by the following underlying principles:

- Creation of a system that is flexible and can respond to unique circumstances;

- Creation of a system that respects differences in faculty responsibilities;

- Creation of a fair and rational system;

- Creation of a system that will not increase staffing costs;

- Creation of a system that factors in the variables affecting workload;

- Creation of a system that can maximize the number of students served;

- Creation of a system that is based on an acceptable range of contact hours instead of a single metric.

- Creation of a system that is perceived as equitable by those working with it.

B. Operational Components of Workload

Discussion about workload must be based on commonly understood and shared institutional expectations related to faculty responsibilities3. These expectations are articulated in RIT's Institute Policy and Procedures Manual (February 1997):

"The view that teaching is the foremost activity of the RIT faculty is deeply rooted in the traditions of the Institution. Consequently, the basic consideration, both in initial appointments and matters pertaining to salary adjustments, promotion and tenure, is the extent to which high standards of teaching can be achieved and maintained" [Policy on Faculty Rank, E6.O].

In the spirit of this policy, teaching at NTID is defined as a broad array of activities that enhance the teaching/learning process. Teaching takes on one of two forms: (a) full-time instruction or (b) educational activities that support the teaching/learning process in some way. Therefore, at NTID, a faculty member is involved in the instructional process by having a primary job responsibility for one of the following activities: instruction; research; counseling and advising; academic support services; and administration (NTID Guidelines, Procedures and Qualifications for Promotion in Rank, pp. 3-4.)

Further, RIT, in its contractual understanding with faculty, expects individuals to divide their time, interests, and expertise across four categories of activity:
(1) Primary Activity;

---

3 These areas of faculty responsibility are detailed in RIT's Tenure and Promotion policies and in NTID's appraisal form. RIT faculty employment policies also provide guidance regarding supplemental activities insofar as: "Initiative by faculty to undertake research, creative endeavors, consulting, participation in professional organizations and/or alternative career development activities adhering to collegially acceptable standards and beyond that specified by formal agreement with the Institute or the Research Corporation is desirable and the Institute encourages it. If such activities require a measurable use of Institute facilities, approval shall be obtained from the dean along with an agreement as to any fair use payment that may be made to the Institute. The application of professional skills in the public interest beyond the campus is also worthy of faculty consideration. Supplemental activities will not be considered as reason for modifying teaching schedules. Additional details as to practices in the department, school or college should be obtained from the department head/director and the dean of the college. Department heads/directors or deans may advise a faculty member of the necessity to modify or cease supplemental activities if they determine that such detracts from the faculty members capacity to fulfill the faculty responsibilities listed above. The Institute assumes no responsibility of any kind in connection with the supplemental activities of its employees" (Institute Policy and Procedures E4.O).

(2) Professional Development (including communication development and other training/development to maintain necessary academic/professional qualifications);

(3) Professional Activities (scholarship and other creative professional endeavors); and

(4) Service Contributions (campus and community).

Given these overall goals of RIT and the specific mission of NTID, the distribution of faculty activities can normally be guided by general college parameters governing allocation of effort. These parameters suggest that the majority of one's effort is spent in activities associated with the primary area of responsibility as outlined in the original letter of agreement. The recommended range of effort is:

1. <u>Allocation of Overall Effort</u>

- Primary Area of Job Responsibility [including curriculum development when and where appropriate to principal activity]   70%

- Professional Activities/Professional Development
- Contributions to the Institute   30%
- Contributions to the Community

How individual faculty actually divide their time among these categories of effort is customarily negotiated with the chairperson and reflected in each faculty member's plan of work. The factors influencing these discussions include:

- Programmatic needs of the department, center, and college;

- Professional development goals and interests of the individual faculty member, especially in relationship to tenure, promotion and future career direction;

- Communication development needs of each faculty member.

The center director works with the chairperson to ensure that individual plans of work support the accomplishment of center/department goals and objectives.

C. Workload Range and Associated Factors

Given the unique nature of the educational services and programming at NTID, the establishment of one standard workload for all faculty is not a reasonable or realistic goal. Instead, what is recommended is a guideline that recognizes the commonalities and the differences in work that faculty engage in. This guideline uses a range of direct contact hours with students as the common threshold for workload and remands to the local unit judgment about specific quarterly assignments and how different workload factors affect such assignment.

1.   Commonalities and Differences

Faculty enjoy similar university expectations regarding the connection and impact that their work should have on students and on scholarly achievement. The venue within which NTID faculty carry out this work differs considerably across centers. In some cases, faculty use the traditional model to accomplish their primary responsibilities. In other instances, faculty work with students in non-traditional or support settings to accomplish these primary work objectives. Regardless of the educational model chosen, interaction with students is primary, and the goals of learning, skill acquisition and human growth and development overarch all activities.

2.   Workload Range

The recommended workload guideline for faculty, regardless of the nature of primary responsibility or type of educational venue is 20-22 direct contact hours with students per week. Each Center will determine how discrete activities relate to this college guideline. In general, the following contact hour guideline will apply.

Primary Areas of Responsibility	**Direct Contact Hour Assignment with Students**
Classroom Instruction	20 - 22 contact hours3
	[Lecture/Class - 12 - 16 contact hours]4
	[Lab/Studio - 14 - 18 contact hours]4
Tutoring/Advising/Liaison	20 - 22 contact hours

Direct Support to Instruction,
Curriculum, and/or Educational Goals:

Counseling Services	20 - 22 contact hours
Speech and Language Services	20 - 22 contact hours
Audiological Services	20 - 22 contact hours
Learning Center (plan hours)	20 - 22 contact hours

Training:
Faculty and Staff Sign Language Program Classroom
Observations and Consultations;

SCPI Services; Outreach, etc.	20 - 22 contact hours
Student Life Programming/Human Development	20 - 22 contact hours

Research:
The CRTL Research Workload Plan calls for full-time research faculty to carry out responsibilities in three areas: a) on-going, applied research projects supporting the NTID mission, b)special institutional projects designated by the NTID Leadership team for special attention (including program feasibility studies), and c) teaching, advising, tutoring, or provision of clinical services on a regular basis. It is expected that approximately 70% of each research faculty member's workload will address these three areas that support NTID's

---

3This range of 20-22 contact hours includes faculty availability (outside of the direct instructional hours) for consultation, tutoring, and general support (See Section 4.A: Faculty Office Hours).

4An individual's actual contact hour assignment will vary and depend on the types of courses being taught. Faculty who teach lecture courses, where the credit hour and contact hour designation are the same, would normally be expected to have a contact hour load toward the lower end of the range. Faculty who teach lab and studio courses, where the credit hour designation is usually less than the contact hour requirements would normally be expected to have a load toward the upper end of the range. Faculty who teach a combination of both lecture and lab/studio will have a workload which is calculated on a proportional basis according to these range guidelines. Each center will prepare its own workload document which details other factors that affect workload [most of which are discussed later in this document].

Overload will be paid based on the above guideline. Specific conditions for overload will be detailed in each center workload document. In all centers, the final determination of when overload is paid will be made through a recommendation of the home department chair to the center director. Such recommendations will consider the overall contact hour load; student class/case load and other departmental and center factors.

mission, with up to 30% of each individual's remaining workload being allocated to communication plans, committee work, and other university service. Responsibilities in the above three areas will balance over time through POW planning in collaboration with department heads and the center director. In the case of on-going research and special institutional projects, the number of distinct research projects carried by individual research faculty members will be determined by the varied time and resource demands of each project. Normally, 4-6 projects per year are carried. These projects may be of a short-term nature, long-term and/or longitudinal studies, or grant-related activities intended to support special college initiatives. Workloads are adjusted accordingly in collaboration with department heads.

Determination of what specific educational/instructional activities with students comprise the 20- 22 hours of student contact is determined within each center and will be clarified in each center document

There are a number of variables which can be expected to affect departmental and center decisions regarding the specifics of an individual faculty member's workload. These include, but certainly are not limited, to:

•   Number of different course preparations required;

•   Discipline of faculty member in relationship to assignment or course;

•   Class/caseload size;

•   Nature of course, educational content, or delivery format;

•   Course/Curriculum development required;

•   Technical laboratory preparation required.

These and other center-specific factors will carry different significance and value within differing circumstances and across different centers. The common thread underlying all variance will be careful analysis and sound judgment on the part of faculty and chairs in arriving at an appropriate mix of activities.

3.   Combination of Activities

In meeting the Strategic Plan mandate for utilization and sharing of faculty resources between departments and across centers, it is important for college workload guidelines to

be easily interpreted and applied, particularly when an individual work plan consists of activities within one or more unit or center.

Using the above guideline, when activities comprising an individual's workplan include different activities, either within the same center or across centers, assignment will be made on a proportional basis. In each case, it is clear that the units involved must participate and agree on the details when workload is shared across units.

4.   <u>Other Related Workload Issues</u>

     A.   Faculty Office Hours

        Faculty availability to students outside of the classroom for consultation, tutoring and general support of the learning process has always been the hallmark of the NTID educational environment. A posted weekly schedule of available times, dedicated weekly office hours or some other type of pre-arrangement with students is the norm. As a technical institution, we recognize that many faculty spend considerable out-of-class time in the laboratory and in this way, many times office hours occur in the setting where the technology resides.

        This type of accessibility is partly dependent on faculty establishing a mechanism by which students have the opportunity to seek assistance at a mutually convenient time. The important element is not where the tutoring activity or contact occurs but that students know how and where to find faculty when a need arises.

     B.   Chairperson Workload

        Considerable attention was given to the workload of chairpeople as a part of our colleges Strategic Plan.

        One objective included in the Strategic Plan states that: "NTID will clearly define the roles and responsibilities of chairpeople to include an emphasis on curriculum

leadership, collaboration, teaching, student advising, applied research and cultural diversity" (SP, 1992, p. 28).

The Organizational Transition Planning Committee in its work and final report suggested that this objective could best be accomplished by redirecting some chair activity away from administrative tasks toward involvement in direct services. It was recommended that, in order to assume direct involvement in the primary function of each department, a reasonable goal is that 20 - 25% of the normal fulltime load of faculty within a department be established as an expectation for the chair (OTPC Final Report, 1993). This goal, therefore, represents the guideline to be used for chairpeople. Using this guideline, if faculty within a department have a 15-contact-hour load, a chairperson would then take on 20-25% of that load.

C.   Overload

Even though each department chairperson is asked to establish an annual staffing plan based on projected student enrollment, there are occasions when faculty may be asked to exceed the recommended workload in one quarter because of unexpected staffing fluctuations. When this occurs, the chairperson will have the flexibility to approve overload compensation. Approved overload will be paid within the quarter in which the overload occurs, unless other arrangements are requested. Circumstances do arise when a faculty member, who is asked to take on an overload, requests to be compensated through a corresponding decrease in load in another quarter. This type of arrangement can be established and must be approved by the chairperson.

D.   Compensation for Work Occurring in June

The question of which June activities carry extra compensation deserves clarification.

The rule of thumb that RIT uses is that any credit-bearing summer quarter activity, because it is outside of normal 10-month faculty contractual obligations, carries compensation regardless of the fact that the courses commence in June while faculty are still on contract. This situation has caused confusion in the minds of many regarding where appropriate lines should be drawn on the issue of June compensation.

At NTID, the only compensable June activities are the following:

- Summer Quarter teaching (credit-bearing courses only)
- Special Sign Language and Interpreter-Training programs (e.g., Pre-AAS Program, Faculty/Staff Sign Language Classes/Workshops; Provost Sign Language Program).
- Educational Outreach activities (outside of POW)

All other activities undertaken in June are considered part of normal faculty contractual responsibilities and do not carry extra compensation. These activities would normally be reflected in the faculty member's approved plan of work.

Summary

In closing, this workload document is intended to serve as a template within which each center will apply these general expectations within an individual center context. Center documents explaining how these general parameters apply will be approved by the Dean and attached to this document, thereby constituting the college's complete workload documentation.

Licata_C_123.wpc
4/3/97:gs