

Workload Policy
Department of Physics
DRAFT v2

I. Mission /Philosophy

The faculty of the Physics Department is dedicated to fulfilling the tripartite mission of the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences of teaching, research, and service. All faculty members contribute substantially to this mission, although with different individual emphases. The faculty as a whole is expected to fulfill the responsibilities of the Department.

II. Academic Year Workload Expectations and Context

The workload policy articulated in this document is intended to provide a set of expectations for the annual performance review defined by the AAUP contract with the University which, as of October 2009, mandates “an annual performance review of each Faculty Member in accordance with the UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY (June 1, 1994).” An extracted portion is given in the Appendix. In this context, the integrated workload expected for all faculty members corresponds to a full-time equivalent effort for the academic year. This policy pertains to the work requirements during the normal academic year beginning at the start of the fall semester, ending at the end of the spring semester and is aligned with the current AAUP/UC contract.

III. What Constitutes 100% Equivalent Effort?

For most members of the Physics Department faculty, the full-time workload (FTW) will comprise substantial fractions each of teaching, research, and service. Faculty members have individual working styles and schedules, so the proportions will vary case by case.

Teaching activity includes formal classroom teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students as well as post-doctoral fellows. **In general the tenure-track members of the faculty are capable of teaching a wide range of courses in the department. The criteria for qualifications expected of instructors at the various levels are specified in a separate document. The department head will exercise her/his professional judgment in making the teaching assignments of all individuals providing instruction for the department.**

As may be surmised from the examples below, the effort expended on a teaching task can vary substantially depending on the assignment and circumstances. For example, teaching a new course generally demands more effort than teaching an existing course. Teaching a very large course may entail a high administrative load. Some courses (such as running a seminar or the colloquium) require less time. In addition, the effort required for student mentoring will vary depending on the individuals involved.

Active research is expected to produce results that are ultimately published in a refereed professional journal. Other signs of an active research program are (but are not limited to) giving

talks at conferences and workshops, giving a seminar or colloquium at other research universities or laboratories, applying for research grants, and supervising graduate students. We expect all research-active faculty to produce one publication per year in an internationally recognized peer-reviewed journal, based on a running average over several years. Exceptions may result from necessities such as setting up a new lab or moving into a new research field. Efforts invested in mentoring of young researchers straddle both the research and teaching missions. We expect all research faculty to obtain research funding or actively pursue research funding at the level required to remain professionally active in their field. As discussed in more detail below, each faculty member will report her/his research activities and outcomes in the Faculty Annual Workload Report, and will estimate the average weekly research effort during the academic year.

All members of our faculty are expected to engage in some service (academic and/or professional) and professional development. At a minimum, each member of the faculty is expected to participate in Departmental faculty meetings, provide an annual report of efforts, and serve actively on at least one Departmental committee each year. Faculty members who serve as Head or Assistant Head, Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies, editor for a professional journal, or significant service on a committee or council, for example, will devote substantially more fractional effort to service work.

Examples illustrating a FTW

In all cases teaching assignments will be the responsibility of the Head. The typical course load for research-active tenure-track and tenured faculty is one course per term during the academic year. Additional teaching and/or service will be expected of faculty who are not research-active. No one model accurately describes the workload of all faculty members, but we provide a few examples of appropriate, per term, FTW efforts:

1. Teaching a 3- or 4-credit course that one has taught before, supervising 1-2 recitations or one lab section, pursuing an active research program, mentoring students, service work and professional development.
2. Teaching a 4-credit service course and serving as course coordinator, supervising 1-2 recitations or one lab section, pursuing an active research program, service work and professional development.
3. Teaching 2 sections of a 4-credit service course, supervising 1-2 recitations or one lab section, pursuing a moderately active research program, service work and professional development.
4. Teaching two 3- or 4-credit courses, supervising 1-2 recitations or one lab section, substantial service work, and professional development.
5. Teaching 2 sections of one 3- or 4-credit course and 1 section of another 3- or 4-credit course, service work and professional development.

A faculty member who is exceeding expectations in one or more aspects of the workload may have their responsibilities for other aspect(s) redirected at the discretion of the Head.

IV. Annual Assessment of Workload

A. Self-Reporting: Faculty Annual Workload Report

In the spring, each faculty member will prepare a Faculty Annual Workload Report (FAWR) that describes academic/professional activities for the previous calendar year. This may include efforts beyond FTW as defined above. The FAWR may in fact be the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) that is submitted to the Head for the faculty member's annual review. The FAWR should summarize the work done sufficiently clearly that other faculty and the Department Head can reasonably determine the overall level of effort and define expectations for the following year's workload in each of teaching, research, and service. The FAWRs will be posted to the Department's internal web site and will be accessible to all faculty in the Department. In general, the report should describe the faculty member's

- **Teaching and Academic Advising Efforts** including a list of courses taught and students formally mentored (advised).
- **Research Program and Products** including a list of publications, talks, grants sought or held, patents submitted or granted, software developed for public use.
- **University and Professional Service** including committee work at the Departmental, College, and University level as well as work for professional societies, work organizing professional conferences, work as a referee or editor for a professional journal, work as an external referee, or panel member for a funding agency.
- **Outreach and Public Service** including work with local students and teachers, public lectures, community presentations, non-scholarly articles for magazines, newspapers, web sites, popular publications.
- **Professional development** including attendance at conferences, workshops, or courses that enhance the faculty member's abilities in support of the department or university's mission.
- **Goals, Plans and Objectives for the Next Reporting Period**, including teaching activities, research activities, service activities, professional development, and any other activities the faculty member deems relevant. The plan should include a proposed breakdown of the workload plan including course load. Any other activities including course requests should be included as well.

B. Committee Review

i. Composition, Procedure for Selection

The Workload Review Committee will consist of three members of the department's faculty who are not on leave during the spring quarter. They will be selected in the following way: **At the beginning of the spring quarter, all faculty will vote for three faculty selected from those who are not on leave for that quarter, who are neither the Head nor the Assistant Head and who agree to serve if elected. Those votes will be tallied and a second round of voting will be made among the top 6 candidates. The top three vote winners in the second round will form the committee.**

ii. Review Procedure, Recommendation

The Workload Review Committee will have the previous year's FAWR (these are all posted publicly). In this way, full attention will be given to the past and present workload efforts made by the faculty, mindful of the expectations laid out by the previous year's work load plan. Each committee member decides whether the proposed workload plan for the coming year, with the faculty's past and present efforts as a guide, constitutes at least 100% FTW. If it does not, then the committee member will suggest a different allocation of workload. **The committee will report all results to the department head and the faculty member.**

V. Head's Responsibility

It is the Head's responsibility to assure that all of the teaching and administrative (service) needs of the department are covered. In making these assignments, the head will consider the requests of the faculty member and the recommendation of the Workload Committee. These assignments will be discussed with the faculty member during his or her annual review with the head and they will be part of the jointly prepared annual summary.

APPENDIX

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY (June 1, 1994)

The annual performance review is seen as complementary to each unit's workload policy and procedures and its mission statements. The annual performance review provides an opportunity to review what was expected of a faculty member as set forth by the workload procedures of that unit as well as the extent to which the mission of the unit is enhanced and supported by the faculty member's activities.

The annual performance review allows the faculty member and the Academic Unit Head to discuss changes in the interests and skills of the faculty member that would change the contributions that the faculty member could make to the unit. It would also allow a discussion of the resources needed by the faculty member to develop or maintain skills, interests, research, scholarship and the like focusing on teaching, research, professional, University, and public service. In this way the annual performance review is both a setting for anticipating the next year and a review of the past. The annual performance review also allows for the accumulation of

evidence for the performance of the faculty member who may be tenured but has not achieved all the promotions available. Others may find it helpful to have a record of review and performance when supervisors and Academic Unit Heads change.

While the review may include accumulating evidence of a faculty member's performance (teaching evaluations, teaching portfolios, new course offerings, grants obtained, papers given and published, contracts negotiated, and the like), the primary purpose for the review is not simply to record an evaluation of a faculty member's performance for the year. The annual performance review works best when it is an instrument for faculty and unit development.

Whatever format the unit devises, it must address teaching, advising, educational innovation, research and creative activity, university, professional, and public service, and other accomplishments pertinent to the mission of the unit balanced according to the unit's mission and workload.

Each annual performance review shall conclude with the joint preparation of a written summary of the review. Either the Academic Unit Head or the faculty member may indicate in writing any differing opinions about the content of the summary statement and such written opinion shall become part of the summary statement. These statements shall become part of the personnel file maintained by each academic unit and a copy of the statement shall be given to the faculty member.