

September 27, 2023

To: NTID Faculty Congress

Re: Response to NTID Faculty Feedback on Revisions to Workload Guidelines

Upon receiving the "Proposed Workload Guidelines Feedback from NTID Faculty" document from NTID Faculty Committee (NFC), with thoughtful deliberation and collaboration, significant progress has been made. The workload guidelines document has been edited to provide clarification.

On September 10th, Kelly Metz Davis, Matthew Lynn, Jess Cuculick, and Gary Behm met to thoroughly examine the questions and suggestions brought forth by NFC. This meeting was productive, allowing us to identify the pertinent points for further discussion by the Workload Guidelines Committee.

Subsequently, on September 15, the Workload Guidelines Committee had the opportunity to meet with Matt and Gary to review and address the responses. We believe that we have addressed these concerns to the best of our abilities. It is important to emphasize that this college-wide document serves as a foundational framework for all departments to adhere to, outlining the four core areas of an NTID faculty member's Plan of Work (POW) while providing guidance on common expectations pertaining to instructional duties. Additionally, for faculty members seeking promotion, it should be used in conjunction with the applicable tenure/promotion policy document.

Kelly Metz Davis attended the NFC's meeting on September 19th, to ensure that our faculty members were well-informed about the latest developments. The information shared during the meeting aligns with the content summarized in this letter, emphasizing our commitment to transparency and open communication within NTID community.

1. **College-Wide Document and Departmental Guidelines:** Please be aware that RIT Policy E07.0.II.F.1.b underscores that "Each college or department may have its own published guidelines for developing a plan of work." Consequently, departments are encouraged to develop their own examples illustrating how workload justification aligns with their specific needs.
 - a) It is important to highlight the uniqueness of NTID compared to its counterparts at RIT. NTID comprises nine distinct disciplines, each with its own unique workload requirements. In contrast to other RIT colleges, which have specific workload guidelines tailored to their respective disciplines, NTID's broad range of instructional duties requires a more comprehensive framework that addresses the diverse needs of our faculty members.
2. **Emphasis on Communication:** Throughout the document, there are statements which emphasize the importance of communication between faculty and department chairpersons regarding workload. Clear consistent dialogue is crucial, especially when workload allocations vary from semester to semester. This principle applies to the assessment of whether the workload should be reassigned or compensated via an overload contract. In collaboration with

Matt, Gary, and Jess, the workload committee has decided to place a stronger emphasis on the importance of faculty members and department chairs engaging in meaningful conversations about workload. These statements serve to reinforce significance of ongoing communication regarding workload.

3. **Review of Scholarship Expectations:** It is recommended that when the new Associate Dean of Research is appointed, they take the initiative to review the scholarship expectations for Tenure-Track faculty (Pre-tenured and Tenured) to ensure alignment between the Workload Guidelines and relevant guidelines and policies for faculty members with scholarship in their POW, including NTID Policy on Promotion in Rank of Tenured Faculty, NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor, and other policies.
4. **Revised Direct and Indirect Instructional Activities:** We have made necessary revisions to the sections concerning Direct and Indirect Instructional Activities to better reflect appropriate workload.
5. **Teaching/Tutoring Portfolio Separation:** A separation of the Teaching/Tutoring Portfolio for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers based on rank was requested. This change aims to provide faculty members and department chairs with the flexibility to gauge if additional emphasis is required in Communication/Diversity or Service, as indicated in their POW.

We believe that these key points will contribute to a more transparent and effective implementation of the Workload Guidelines within our NTID Community. We encourage all faculty members to review the revised document and engage in discussions with their department chairs as needed and look forward to the open forums.

Sincerely,

NTID Workload Guidelines Committee

Kelly Metz Davis, Chair

Janine Butler

Marguerite Carrillo

Patrick Graham

Marcus Holmes

Karen Tobin

Questions were sorted into two categories, “Responses” and “Suggested Changes/Considerations”; and based on importance in each category.

Responses:

24. It should be made clear in the document that negotiations can be made with your department chair in terms of workload (class size, classes you teach, etc)

Final: There are statements that clearly emphasize communication between faculty and chairperson should occur in reference to workload throughout the document.

1. On the first page:
 - a. “In accordance with RIT policy E7.0, the workload of an individual faculty member is to be reflected in a Plan of Work (POW), which outlines an agreement between the faculty member and chair regarding goals for teaching, scholarship, and service.”
 - b. “A POW can be amended by the mutual consent of the faculty member and department chair at any time, and that year’s self-appraisal and appraisal reflect the degree to which the faculty member completed the expectations as outlined in the POW.”
 - c. “The specific distribution of workload components in any given POW is subject to negotiation between faculty member and chair.”
2. On page 5:
 - . “Chairs and faculty members in each discipline and department must acknowledge the nature of each course when determining instructional workload.”
 - a. “When developing the POW, the faculty member and chairperson should consider how any of the following circumstances might impact the number of student contact hours a faculty member is expected to provide.”

2. There needs to be specific conditions in place to move a T/TT faculty from a balanced portfolio to a teaching portfolio when their research isn't deemed sufficient. Otherwise, the system could easily be abused and opens the university to future lawsuits.

Final: This process should be happening as part of the annual appraisal and POW development process. A faculty member and chair should agree in writing in a POW exactly what the expectations are for the faculty member in terms of scholarship for the upcoming academic year. If a tenured faculty member is assigned to the balanced portfolio but is not undertaking a sufficient amount of research activities as determined by whether or not the items listed in the POW have been met, the chair’s appraisal should indicate the deficiency in this area and offer options for how to proceed, either increase the research activity (perhaps through the use of FEAD funds) or switch to the teaching/tutoring portfolio. As such, a chair needs to be willing to assign a relatively low score on the scholarship portion of the appraisal to ensure movement one way or the other.

3. I would also like to see a research portfolio brought back for T/TT faculty who are supervising graduate students in RIT PhD programs. As we move to an R1 University, NTID continues to be behind RIT. T/TT faculty in RIT PhD programs have 1-1 teaching loads. We should do the same for the few faculty here who are actively doing research and supervising graduate students in PhD programs.

Final: The NTID research portfolio was removed when we were faced with the federal sequestration a decade or so ago. As a college we should definitely consider adding it back into the workload guidelines document but doing so is not likely to happen as part of the current revisions, especially without someone serving in the role as Associate Dean for Research. Some important points to resolve before adding the research portfolio back into the workload guidelines include:

- It must be clear that the PhD students being mentored fit into one of the two areas of NTID's mission statement.
- There must be clear guidelines for the circumstances in which a faculty member can be moved to this portfolio including, perhaps, review by the Associate Dean for Research
- A determination needs to be made regarding a faculty member's ability to buy-out time assigned for instructional duties
- Faculty members who are involved in this kind of teaching/mentorship of graduate students should probably be listed as the instructor of record in SIS for the graduate coursework in which the student is enrolled for this effort to be clearly indicated as instruction/mentorship of the student by the NTID faculty member. Otherwise, in the absence of SIS-documented instructional effort, there should be clear evidence of the grant-related mentoring activities that are more involved than being a service type of activity.

4. With two portfolios for tenure-track, it needs to be made clear who is on which (not names, but how to determine. Research productivity?)

Final: See responses to **questions 2 and 3**. The annual appraisal process should sort this kind of issue out and a faculty member should be in regular consultation with the department chair about expectations in all areas of responsibility.

15. Administrators: Is it assumed that all NTID faculty entering administrative portfolio have minimum SLPI of Advanced? If that is the practice, that's fine. A footnote should be added.

Final: Please refer to the Tenure Promotion guidelines for communication.

15a. All faculty hired into lecturer lines will have minimum SLPI of Advanced? Clarify this in document or refer to a policy that states this.

Final: Please refer to your hire letter and consult with your department chair. This question pertains to hiring policy and practice, not to the workload guidelines (which pertain to already-hired faculty).

15b. Response to question is in the Suggested Changes/Considerations section.

10. Indirect instructional activities: I am aware of a practice that some faculty tutors count contact hours for appointments that students skip. I would add a statement here that clarifies that skipped tutoring appointments are "indirect" instructional activities.

Final: It will indeed occasionally happen that a student does not show up for an instructor's office hours or for a scheduled tutoring appointment. The instructor should utilize that time for other direct or indirect activities.

11. On page 5, "General factors to consider in setting workload for faculty with tutoring responsibilities" should have a few added/modified bullets:

a. "Concurrent assignment of direction instruction responsibility" should be replaced with "Concurrent assignment of direction instruction responsibility will be associated with a 10% workload release as defined on page 2."

Final: A college-wide workload guidelines document is not the place for such a statement. Any deviation from the baseline should be handled through discussion between the faculty member and department chair as part of the annual review and POW development process.

12. It only seems to have helped the Tenure Track.

Final: Although more specific information is needed to address the intent of this statement, the response to **question 16** may provide some clarification

16. If a percentage range for Communication/Diversity is deemed appropriate for any NTT faculty, the Teaching/Tutoring will need a corresponding range too.

Final: Correct, and the guidelines have been modified so that the percentages that are provided in the table on page 1 for NTT faculty are consistent with how they have been calculated for tenure-track faculty and administrators. Specifically, the teaching/tutoring allotment for lectures has been changed from 90% to the range 80-90%, consistent with an instructional load that is the equivalent of eight 3-credit courses per contract year. For senior and principal lecturers, the teaching/tutoring allotment has been changed to 70-80% to reflect the one-course difference in instructional duties that NTT faculty at these ranks receive relative to NTT faculty at the rank of lecturer. Assuming that all faculty represented in the table have a 5-10% Communication and Diversity component, the Service components for NTT faculty have been adjusted to 5-10% for lecturers and 10-20% for senior/principal lecturers.

14. The communication portion mentions a week-long intensive sign class at the beginning of the contract year. I have never even heard of this. What is this?

Final: The document should be modified to refer faculty to programs and courses that are offered through the NTID Sign Language Assessment and Resource Center (NSLARC).

15. Administrators: Is it assumed that all NTID faculty entering administrative portfolio have minimum SLPI of Advanced? If that is the practice, that's fine. A footnote should be added.

Final: Please refer to the Tenure Promotion guidelines for communication.

15a. All faculty hired into lecturer lines will have minimum SLPI of Advanced? Clarify this in document or refer to a policy that states this.

Final: Please refer to your hire letter and consult with your department chair. This question pertains to hiring policy and practice, not to the workload guidelines (which pertain to already-hired faculty).

20. There is also a lot less specificity in the document for scholarship compared to teaching – these should be considered to be of equal value and weight for balanced portfolio TT faculty, but that is not apparent given the disparate attention they receive in the document.

Final: The primary purpose of this document is to outline the four areas of an NTID faculty member's POW and to give guidance on common expectations regarding instructional duties. Specific recommendations about increasing the specificity of the document in terms of scholarship activities (as well as other areas of the NTID POW) are certainly welcome, but each faculty member with scholarship responsibilities will have an agenda that is distinct from that of other faculty members with scholarship responsibilities. Attempting to indicate in this

document how much time is necessary for preparing a grant application or seeing a manuscript through the development and review processes is therefore difficult.

22. The workload committee were told not to touch scholarship, but that is wrong as it should be considered and looked at. It should be part of the workload guidelines and be on par to the other universities in terms of scholarship.

Final: See response to **question 20**.

23. It's clear that administration doesn't really understand what is involved in scholarship – overlooking scholarship makes it worse for them. They need to be mindful of this.

Final: Need more information regarding the individual's concern.

25. Guidelines for NTID shouldn't divert too greatly from what other colleges are doing as we don't want our students to be looked down upon more than they already are.

Final: Committee and Administration does not know how to address this question. If the faculty member wants to provide clarification, we would be open to addressing this concern.

26. Promotion, POW, and guidelines are NOT in alignment. Curriculum is not valued in promotion. Why is this not carried as much as scholarship peer reviewed scholarship, shouldn't just be limited to that.

Final: The workload guidelines provide foundational information for the development of each faculty member's plan of work. They are explicitly tied to a POW as clearly summarized on the first page of the guidelines document. Promotion, however, is something that is achieved by undertaking duties as part of a POW in an exemplary manner and is determined/awarded through the shared-governance promotion review process in accordance to RIT policy E06.0 and the several NTID Policy on Promotion and Policy on Tenure and Promotion documents. In other words, these workload guidelines are not intended to be a guide for how to be promoted. Rather, they are guidelines for NTID faculty workload standards that should be used in conjunction with the applicable tenure/promotion policy document for faculty who are seeking such professional advancement.

27. How much does NTID spend on overloads or adjuncts? Is there any language regarding overloads? Can we do this in the middle of the semester? How can we support faculty who have unanticipated workload increases?

Final: Constant communication between faculty member and department chair should occur in regards to workload. POWs are developed for the full academic year and if the assigned duties for one semester are more than the average amount, the next semester may be less than the average amount as agreed upon. This applies to determining whether workload should either be assigned to someone else or compensated via overload contract.

Suggested Changes/Considerations:

1. Classroom and office hour contact are both shown as a range, but the total student contact hours are shown as fixed numbers.

a. Is it the expectation of NTID that these fixed numbers are the semester targets for each rank? If so, that should be noted in the "***" footnote.

Final: Yes, these numbers are semester targets. The wording of this footnote can therefore be changed to read "The total student contact hours are the normal semester

targets for each faculty rank indicated. The student contact hours for Senior and Principal Lecturers ...”

b. If not, a range should also be shown for the total student contact hours per semester

Final: No response because answer to 1a is “Yes”.

5. The math doesn't add up. Balanced people should be 4-4.5 courses per year, not 4-5. I don't think it's OK to round up in these cases. So generally, a faculty on the balanced portfolio should be teaching 2 courses per semester, with some rare exceptions.

Final: Total student contact, not number of sections taught, is the emphasis of the revised guidelines and this should be calculated by the instructor and chair when determining a POW. Perhaps the bulleted lists on pages 3 and 4 should be re-ordered to place the contact hours line as the first bulleted item in each list and then the remaining lines can be indicated as examples of how a faculty member might be expected to reasonably reach this contact-hour target.

8. The tutoring guidelines on page 10 seem very, very heavy. Three tutoring courses will equate to one three credit course. For tutors who tutor 300 or 400 level COS courses, there is a A LOT of prep that goes into those courses. So, to expect a lecturer who has 28 hours to tutor 12 courses seems very, very high.

Final: Please see response to **question 5**.

6. The lecturer column should be split. There are clear percentages for lecturers, but it becomes confusing with both in one column.

Final: The workload committee completed this revision as indicated in the question/comment and will also include the response to **question 15b** in making this modification.

15b. What about senior lecturers currently at NTID with less than Advanced? Do these individuals still exist? If not, a footnote should be added. If yes, these individuals should have the opportunity to increase Communication/Diversity to 10% to work towards an Advanced rating.

Final: A range will be included for Communication and Diversity to allow for flexibility to focus in the area that needs it. A discussion between the faculty and the chair should happen to ensure agreement for POW expectations.

17. Communication/Diversity and Service hours: a total of 30-120 hours per semester based on rank should be achieved to satisfy the faculty's POW based on their rank and workload guideline requirements. - This is a VERY BROAD range. This is very, very unclear. 30 hours is around 2 hours per week, while 120 hours is around 8.5 hours per week (both over 14 weeks). More clear guidance here is appreciated.

Final: See response to **question 16**. The range remains fluid to ensure faculty satisfy the communication requirements. A conversation between the instructor and chair should result in an agreement on the percentage of the faculty member's POW that focuses on this area.

7. Not including preparation as contact hours is extremely unfair and harmful to tutoring faculty and mixed model faculty. Those who tutor invest SIGNIFICANT amounts of time in preparing practice questions and doing feedback on assignments/projects/presentations/studio assignments/labs for DHH students enrolled at RIT colleges. This effort should be counted, because most of this work is not done in front of the student. If a faculty invests 3 hours into making great practice questions, but only sees the student for 20 min to check the answers, how is that fair?

Final: The definitions of “direct instructional activities” and “indirect instructional activities” should be clarified so that the former is part of the contact-hour calculation and the latter is not. Suggested wording is as follows:

- Direct instructional activities: Teaching (in the classroom, laboratory, or other environments including online synchronous and asynchronous activities) and office hours, meetings with students and email (or other) exchanges with students during and outside of office hours and tutoring appointments that directly pertain to course material. For faculty tutors, direct instructional activities include tutoring students and liaison effort with the home college. Activities in this category **do** count toward the direct student contact hours described above.
- Indirect instructional activities: Reasonable and appropriate amounts of course development, preparation, and evaluation activities, including grading, providing feedback to students regarding their course-related work. Activities in this category **do not** count toward the direct student contact hours described above.
- Regarding whether or not the amount of course development a faculty member undertakes regularly is “reasonable and appropriate”, all teaching and tutoring faculty need to undertake some amount of preparation for their work with students as a regular part of their instructional effort without any kind of reduction in contact time with students. Instructors who need to prepare outside of a normal range, such as to teach or tutor a new course assignment, should discuss this with their department chair to determine whether the amount of time being invested should be reduced or whether some other allowance (e.g., overload, course reduction elsewhere in POW, etc.) should be considered.

9. I would include a statement that indicates faculty tutoring that occurs through asynchronous means (i.e., emailing, developing a short tutorial) should be counted as direct instructional activities. The time the student engages with the material cannot be measured, but the tutor should record and document the time they put forth constructing emails or other educational resources to tutees.

Final: See response to **question 7**.

21. The idea that grading and course development do not count towards academic year effort is a little galling. It definitely should be!

Final: Refer to **question 7**.

13. Tenure track is used vaguely throughout the document, please solidify. *note that the heading on the draft still uses the term “tenured,” while that was recently revised in the table.

Final: The title of the document should be changed to “NTID Faculty Workload Guidelines for Tenure-Track (Pre-Tenured and Tenured) Faculty and Lecturers” and any similar wording within the document should be changed as well.

18. If service is deemed necessary for lecturers at ALL ranks, clearly delineate, with an additional table column, how those service expectations should differ between lecturers and promoted lecturers.

Final: Committee should consider including a footnote. Section 4 is already written broadly enough to cover various service activities.

19. There is one inconsistency between the proposed workload guidelines and the examples in the appendices. For the teaching/tutoring portfolio example, the total for direct instructional activity for teaching/tutoring is only 16 hours a week, when the guidelines state that it should be 21 hours a wk.

Final: NFC recommended appendix to be removed.