

Date: February 20, 2014

From: Dennis K. Miller

Subj: Intercampus Faculty Council Report – February 11, 2014

To: Faculty Council

The following summarizes important issues for our campus from the February 11 Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) meeting.

1. Christopher Spilling (IFC representative from UM-SL) expressed his concerns about the impact on his campus of budget reallocations under strategic planning. Dr. Spilling said that he is concerned basic services and core programs are being sacrificed to move a disproportional amount of resources to the areas defined under UM-SL's plan. President Tim Wolfe responded, "you can't be better at everything. Addition from subtraction is the only way it will work in a market that is as competitive as it is today. The question is, 'where are we subtracting?'" Later he said, "For 50 years we've allocated new money from the state the same way [evenly among campuses] because it's easy. We've changed that. Stop putting up with easy. If we don't we marginalize everything, we'll be known for nothing. We can't survive on easy."

Hank Foley (Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs) commented on strategic planning, "we're in a time when we have to look at every dollar. There isn't any fat left in the system anywhere for us to use and to use frivolously. Administrators need to do everything they can to stay on strategic plans and fulfilling their mission. It's not obvious it's going to get better and we need to adjust to a new normal for higher education. It's much worse at other places than what we're experiencing at the University of Missouri."

Dr. Foley and President Wolfe announced new internet resources (www.umsystem.edu/strategicplan) on the UM System website that has public information on strategic planning. On the left side of the page look for a link "Dashboard>>": It has a lot of information on what MU has done and will be doing and allow you to see what they're doing at UM-KC, UM-SL and UM-S&T. On the right side there is a link "Download Our New Strategic Planning Brochure". It provides a general overview of President Wolfe's philosophy regarding the Strategic Plan.

2. Dr. Foley briefly discussed changing priorities in the UM System and on each campus regarding intellectual property development. He said we need to work to bring more faculty members in contact with industry and corporate sponsors to make up for losses in federal research funding. As part of this effort, Dr. Foley said we will need to change our policies regarding intellectual property and that he wants to work with faculty members to evaluate policies for protecting property.

Dr. Foley encouraged faculty members to read the executive summary of a paper he recently published on intellectual property and higher education. The summary is attached.

3. A request for proposals on course sharing across campuses was developed by IFC and is currently circulated across divisions in the UM System. The request is attached. "Creating disciplinary communities across our four campuses is important", said Hank Foley. "What's possible here?", he asked. Dr. Foley and Steve Graham (Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs) said emphatically that course sharing is not a first step toward shared degrees and consolidation across the four UM campuses.

4. IFC continued discussion on a statement on faculty workload, which is attached. The workload document was requested by President Wolfe and Dr. Foley, but was written by IFC members and Dr. Graham. Tony Lupo represented MU on the workload committee.

During discussions, some IFC members suggested a review by faculty members of tenure and post-tenure review policies.

Grant funding to expand course sharing at the University of Missouri

The University of Missouri System is providing funding to encourage faculty members to share their expertise with other UM campuses. The initiative is designed to encourage the sharing of courses among the four UM campuses to increase options for students, provide opportunities for faculty development leaves, or even expand departmental offerings. In the past, one of the major barriers to sharing courses has been that when students from one campus take courses from another UM campus, the home campus loses tuition fees. Based on the work at other universities, this initiative is designed to promote course sharing and collaborative programs and overcome that barrier.

Grants will be awarded to develop and offer “shared courses” where courses are available to students on at least one other UM campus. The courses could be delivered through conferencing software (e.g. Adobe Connect, WebEx), as a blended or hybrid class, a fully online class, or through other similar methods. A total of \$250,000 is available and awards will be made in the spring of 2014. Proposals will be funded for up to \$10,000* per course. Preference will be given to proposals that tie multiple courses together that can be shared across at least two campuses – thus increasing the overall impact.

Background and course sharing in Missouri and elsewhere:

- The Board of Curators has expressed interest in seeing more collaboration among the UM campuses in sharing courses, faculty, and in developing collaborative degree programs.
- Each of the campuses already has similar arrangements with community partner institutions (e.g., UMSL and Washington University or St. Louis University, MU and Columbia College, etc.)
- Other university systems like the University of Maryland and Penn State have used course sharing or course cooperatives for a number of years (Maryland for over 20 years).
- UM campuses have participated in the Missouri Alliance for Collaborative Education (MACE) - but only on a limited basis.

Guidelines for course sharing:

- Collaborations should be as flexible as possible, not prescriptive and provide flexibility to allow academic programs to decide what will be most efficient.
- Faculty will provide oversight for the shared courses and monitor the quality of the offerings.
- The shared courses should be seen as valuable to the department so the proposals should have the support of the department chair.
- The primary goals of this effort would be to expand course offerings and to share department faculty across campuses. This course sharing initiative can free up faculty time for other activities such as research, teaching additional courses for majors, or to take on special

department or college assignments. In other cases, courses with low enrollments could be offered by enrolling students from other campuses.

Definitions:

Home institution: campus where student is admitted and currently enrolled

Host institution: campus that is offering the course

Shared courses: courses designed to allow students from other UM campuses to enroll in them

Basic principles#:

1. UM campuses would develop a course cooperative – a system where campuses could share courses that are not at capacity and students from other UM campuses could enroll.
2. Students pay the tuition and fees for the shared courses to their **home** campus.
3. Students register for courses at their home campus though the course is being taught by an instructor at another UM campus. Thus students will NOT transfer credit and courses are considered in-residence courses.
4. All UM campuses use Blackboard as the learning management system, but modifications will have to be made to allow students at another campus have access to the host institution's course.
5. Grades are awarded by the host institution and sent to cooperating instructors at the home institutions.
6. Semester schedule will follow the host institution. UM campus schedules vary only slightly but some consideration will be given to allow for students to match with their home campus schedule (tests, papers, etc.).
7. Faculty panels can review courses for appropriateness and quality control to ensure courses meet local campus standards with appropriate faculty credentials, etc.

Financial Incentive

To promote the cross-campus course sharing, UM Academic Affairs will provide an incentive of \$300 to the host campus for each student who enrolls in the course from another UM campus. For example, if UMKC offers a course that has capacity of 20 students and only 10 UMKC students enroll, but five enroll from other UM campuses, the UMKC campus would get an additional \$1500. This arrangement would provide incentives for campuses to offer courses in the “cooperative” and share courses with the other campuses. While the campuses will likely have different policies on how these incentive funds are distributed – some of the incentive funding should go to the faculty member teaching the course that is shared.

Application for funding

Proposals for funding should be a brief summary describing the rationale for developing a shared course and the results that will be achieved. At least two campuses must be involved to secure funding but three or more UM campuses would be ideal. The proposals should be brief - no longer than 5 pages – and address the proposal elements listed below. The goal for each shared course or set of courses is to create release time for other campus faculty, increase the offerings available to students on other UM campuses, or provide additional opportunities for the home department.

Budget note: proposals will be judged on their overall merit with an eye toward development that stretches the funding as much as possible. Typically the funding would cover the cost of finding a replacement to provide a course release for faculty members so they can develop a new course. Proposals can also include funding for special materials needed as well as design costs if appropriate.

Proposal elements (5 pages maximum)

Each proposal should include a brief section to address the following:

1. Name of course and typical enrollment
2. Rationale for developing a shared course
3. Budget
4. Nature of impact if course is developed and shared
5. Campus partners – including names of cooperating faculty members
6. Support from the home and cooperating departments (e.g., signature approval, or letters or emails indicating support from department chair and dean)

Review criteria

Proposals will be evaluated based on their creativity, design elements that foster learning, collaborative elements (e.g., cooperating faculty, campuses and departments), and potential for overall impact. A committee comprised of IFC faculty members, provosts' office representatives and a representative from the UM System academic affairs will review the proposals.

Deadline for Proposals

Proposals are due **April 15, 2014** and should be submitted to Academic Affairs, 309 University Hall, University of Missouri System, Columbia, MO 65211. Prior to their submission to the UM System Academic Affairs office, the proposals should be submitted to the respective campus provost's office for a final campus review.

Ideas adapted from University of Maryland Inter-institutional Registration Procedure [University of Maryland Regents Bylaws 71.0 III-2.40 and 73.0 III-2.41] and the Missouri Alliance for Collaborative Education [described in Redmond, W. 2012, Collaboration in Missouri Higher Education, *Teacher-Scholar*, 4(1)]

* Where multiple departments are developing courses the maximum could be as high as \$15,000 per course

A New Approach to Intellectual Property for Industry Funded Research

Today land-grant universities are called upon to become major engines for national and regional innovation. They must be more dynamic and nimble, accelerate the transfer of science into technology, foster entrepreneurship, and to enhance the development of industrial research partnerships. In order to be successful, it is time for universities to challenge the outdated notion that they must own all the intellectual property derived from industry-funded research.

Since the Morrill Act of 1862, one of the major purposes of land-grant universities has been to do research with practical value and disseminate this knowledge to better society. The creation of new inventions and innovation was motive enough and for many decades the universities did not try to protect its innovations or inventions. But with the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 and the recognized success of blockbuster innovations at the University of Florida, the University of Wisconsin, and Michigan State, the climate changed to protect intellectual property with the goal of creating significant income streams. But public universities inadvertently misplaced the commitment to the betterment of all - in exchange for the benefits to the universities themselves.

Examining the actual experience at a major land-grant research university during the past 20 years demonstrates how this thinking inadvertently ends up stifling research, curbs innovation, and curbs the ability to use research and innovation for a tool to enhance student success.

Research expenditures grew significantly as the efficacy of the university's research enterprise matured – growing from \$290 million in the early 1990's to over \$800 million in 2011. Likewise, invention disclosures rose from just 66 annually to over 200 a year by 2000. At the peak of disclosure filings that year, about one-third of disclosures were converted into issued patents. But as the number of disclosures was rising, so were expenditures to manage this activity. It was already evident by 2001 that a problem was developing in that expenditures to create and manage IP were outpacing revenues. By 2002, the university was expending about \$1.9 million on patent costs each year, but the licensing revenue, including patent cost reimbursement, was running a half a million dollars below the costs.

To control expenditures, the university decided that fewer disclosures would merit patent protection, which had the effect of throttling back the number of disclosures filed and patents issued at the university. From a high of 70 patents issued each year in 2001 the number settled to about 35 per year by 2010. Disclosures that were not patented were abandoned but even then the expenses continued to climb until the gap between expenditures and reimbursements grew. The university licensing revenues had climbed from \$10,000 in 1990 to \$1 over a million in 2010. The patent costs climbed to over \$2 million in 2010 – creating an annual gap of \$1 million.

While the university's intellectual property enterprise was supposed to be cost-neutral, it was clear in the 20 years of effort that had not happened. By then, the university held almost 600 active patents – the great majority of which have not garnered any interest, let alone developed any revenue generating capacity. The goal of protecting the great university-developed intellectual property and hitting a home run with a revenue stream did not materialize.

The entire premise of this approach had to be questioned – so the university decided to investigate whether or not it would lose considerable licensing revenue if it were to let the IP flow to the sponsor. Examining the university's data showed that industry-funded research comprised at most 12 percent of research expenditures each year. Yet, of the 1,197 inventions disclosed between 2000 and 2007, only 92 disclosures— or less than 8 percent— resulted from *de novo* industry-funded research.

Which meant that over 90 percent of the university's IP was derived from other forms of research funding, namely that from federal and state agencies. Further, of the 92 invention disclosures resulting from industry-funded research, 30 led to 18 license agreements. Worse, of those 18 licenses, only 4 generated any revenue—a total of \$92,000 between 2000 and 2007, or \$13,000 per year. It is clear that both the return on investment and the cost-benefit ratio are markedly negative.

If the university had not insisted on owning the IP from industry-sponsored research would the university have better served its mission as a land-grant university? Would there have been more regional or national innovations? Given the widely accepted notion that doing research leads to new products and inventions and that regardless of the nature of the funding – doing more research would increase innovation.

Assume that 50 percent of would-be sponsors accept the IP ownership provisions and that 50 percent of those will proceed even after the licensing arrangements are detailed (and 50 percent likely overestimates the real number of negotiations that succeed when these two issues arise), that means only 25 percent of potential research agreements would be successfully concluded! Removing the first hurdle by definition removes the second hurdle. So we can conclude that at least four times more industry-funded research could have been done over the last 30 years, had the university not followed the commonly adopted standard of insisting that it own all of its IP.

This is an enormous amount of research that was never done—at least in partnership with these universities. It represents an enormous loss to universities in terms of opportunities for both faculty members and students to acquire new learning, apply their knowledge in industry contexts, and develop new relationships and new interests. It is also a loss to the nation - new innovations with commercial success and economic benefit could have emerged the research.

A NEW APPROACH TO THIS PORTION OF THE RESEARCH ENTERPRISE IS WARRANTED.

- ❖ The value to universities for industry-sponsored research lies in research itself, in the support of that research and in the relationship with the partner, not in the ownership of IP.
- ❖ The best agreement is the simplest form of agreement that is necessary and sufficient to meet the needs of the program and reduce negotiation to a minimum.
- ❖ If industry funding is a pass-through of federal dollars, or if industry funding is matching federal funding, then public universities must retain ownership of IP by law. In such cases, the universities can offer flexible licenses.
- ❖ When there must be an exception to the above principles, universities should strive to explain it fully and clearly to the industry sponsor and then seek the best way to handle the exception to the benefit of both partners.

The real value of industry-sponsored research lies in the value of the research itself, in the economic benefit it may provide to society, and in the deeper relationships that it fosters between faculty members and students and their counterparts in industry. Engagement in industry-sponsored research even benefits students who are not directly involved. Faculty members who engage with practitioners develop a deeper appreciation of the connections between theory and practice, which informs their teaching, opening up new channels of thinking for them, and making them better able to prepare students for the working world.

IFC Statement on Faculty Workload
IFC Task Force
February 19, 2014

Introduction and Background:

Due to increasing pressure on budgets, increasing student enrollment, and increasing public scrutiny, more attention has been focused on the workload of faculty in today's public universities. After several discussions with President Wolfe, the UM intercampus faculty council (IFC) created a task force to examine the faculty workload policies. The committee's charge was to determine how to create policies where all faculty members could flourish, the workload is more or less evenly distributed within departments and across units, there is a shared sense of responsibility for monitoring workload, and where faculty have the greatest degree of autonomy in carrying out their work.

The task force was comprised of one senior faculty member[#] from each of the UM campuses and was staffed by the Office of Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee members held discussions with IFC members about key issues, consulted various University of Missouri school and college workload policies, consulted relevant UM policy documents, and interviewed current UM department chairs on all four campuses. The committee also looked at a number of other workload policies from peer institutions to get a sense of potentially useful practices adopted elsewhere.

After reviewing the information noted above – the committee drew the following initial conclusions:

- ✓ The existing UM Collected Rules and Regulations on faculty workload (310.080) appear to be fairly well written. The CR&R provide for variable workloads by academic unit and include approvals by the dean and provost to ensure they are meeting department and college expectations before adoption. A formal five-year review of the workload policy is required as part of the departmental five-year reviews.
- ✓ CR&R 310.080 recommends different assignments for faculty members based on the needs of the departments. It specifically states, “The Department Chair, in consultation with the individual faculty member, will determine a faculty member's assignments and distribution of effort in the areas of teaching, research, service and administration relative to the departmental workload standard. Assignments among faculty members will vary to meet the objectives of the department.”
- ✓ The committee members recognized that diverse academic units have variable needs and carry out their work differently. Thus, prescriptive policy statements that apply to all colleges and schools on each campus would not be suitable.

Implementation Issues

Despite the flexible nature of the current CR&R on faculty workload, conditions exist where some faculty members take on a much greater load than others. Previous practices and cultural norms can at times trump concerns for equity, and department chairs report feeling handicapped in ensuring that all faculty members carry a fair share of the department's responsibilities. In interviewing department chairs, task force members reported that:

- A number of “deals” exist with faculty members that reduce their teaching load or create special arrangements.
- Department chairs feel they bound to the “deals” – although they may not have been involved in making them. At times deals are made at the dean or provost level.
- Chairs and associate deans often report that they would like concrete guidelines they can draw upon instead of negotiating with each faculty member. They would also like alternative benefits they can offer for special assignments other than a “reduced teaching load” that is often used.
- In many cases chairs are not well informed on the best practices and can be persuaded to accept arrangements with faculty members they later find are not in the best long-term interest of the department.
- Some chairs report they find it easier to “pick up the extra slack” by personally teaching more or taking on other responsibilities when extra effort is needed, rather than push those who are not sharing the load.
- Chairs often do not know how to address performance issues with faculty to ensure the department workload is implemented fairly across the unit without disrupting the departmental culture.
- There is a general recognition that different faculty have different strengths in teaching, research and service. However, there is resistance to adjusting the standard 40/40/20 workload to address imbalances.
- For any workload adjustments to be successful, chairs feel they need the support of their deans and provosts so that all departments in a college or school adopt similar approaches.

Policy Statements:

The attached document articulates a number of issues and principles that can be used to create equitable workload assignments for academic departments. Embedded are the assumptions that:

- Finding a fair way to distribute work among the tenured/tenure track/non-tenure track faculty is critical in today's climate.
- It is a shared responsibility campus-wide to implement workload policies that are flexible, make adjustments for individual faculty talents, vary based on the special talents of the faculty, and produce conditions where all faculty members feel they can be successful.
- Practices that foster “self-monitoring” and flexibility in allocating faculty workload assignments are preferred over prescriptive policies or restrictive rules written at the university system level.

- One strategy for promoting an equitable workload distribution is to make the details of the department members' workload assignments transparent. A comprehensive document listing workload assignments can be distributed each year explaining how faculty members meet their commitment to the department and college.
- Faculty members, such as endowed chairs, whose appointments include a reduced teaching assignment, are expected to meet higher research and scholarship standards to justify the reduced teaching load. The department chair should review these workload assignments annually.
- Any changes in current practices must include cooperation among department chairs, deans, and provosts. This includes monitoring campus and college workload policies, reviewing and monitoring instructional waivers, and reviewing the productivity of departments in the context of the campus and national norms for peer institutions.
- The IFC should work with the campus provosts to identify best practices and proper training for department chairs.
- IFC should present their recommendations to the chancellors and general officers to create support and buy-in from the very top levels of the University.

UM Collected Rules and Regulations on Faculty Workload - 310.080:

http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch310/310.080_regular_faculty_workload_policy

DRAFT

University of Missouri Faculty Workload

Faculty Workload: A Rationale

The University of Missouri holds itself to a high standard of accountability. Like all universities, a significant portion of the University of Missouri budget is devoted to faculty costs. Hence, it is crucial that faculty costs be allocated efficiently and effectively to best support the teaching, research, and service missions of the University system. Currently, faculty workloads are allocated differently across departments, colleges, and campuses. If effectively designed, a workload allocation process can enhance faculty productivity by capitalizing upon the relative strengths of the individual faculty members. Further, a well-designed faculty workload policy can create rewards for faculty members that perform admirably in their respective areas of expertise. Such rewards might include favorable annual performance reviews, above-average salary increases, or special assignments.

This document seeks to establish principles that departments can use to efficiently allocate workload across faculty members to the benefit of the collective faculty in the university¹. The motivation for the document is twofold. First, it will provide academic officers and department heads with a template for allocating the unit's workload to insure equity in distributing a department's duties. Second, in the spirit of accountability, it will help to inform external stakeholders about the workload involved in the University's units and how that workload is allocated among faculty members to achieve the most effective combination of activities.

For any workload policy to be effective, the overarching principle is that department faculty members should focus on what they do best. Further, viewing productivity from a department-wide perspective is more useful than evaluating the productivity of individual faculty members. The faculty workload in a department typically includes teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service responsibilities. The teaching activity is the most quantifiable component. Department heads determine the courses that will be offered each semester and the number of sections of these courses. The teaching workload is then allocated to faculty members based on their pre-determined credit hour teaching requirement.

Adhering to the principle that faculty should focus on what they do best, the teaching assignment for active and successful researchers could be reduced so that these faculty members can maximize the research, publications, grants, or other scholarly activities as defined by the academic department. Those faculty members who are less prolific on the research dimension but are effective teachers then could cover a greater percentage of the teaching workload.

Key to the success of the process is that faculty members who are asked to invest a greater amount of time in either the teaching or research missions are rewarded when they excel in that dimension. It follows that a well-designed and administered workload

¹ Many Universities have such a policy and process. The task force reviewed several such documents and found the working document at Drexel University to be especially well conceived. Thus, the Drexel document was used as a template for developing this document.

allocation process can result in a situation where all faculty members experience better performance evaluations. The prolific researcher will have more time to work on publications, grants, or other scholarly activities, and the prolific teacher would be handsomely rewarded for outstanding results in the classroom.

It must be emphasized here that the awarding of tenure and promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor requires excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Hence, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors seeking tenure and/or promotion will not be able to gain such promotion solely on only one of the dimensions of academic activity.

Workload Philosophy

The overarching principle for assignment of faculty workloads is to assure that departments fulfill their responsibilities in teaching, research, and service. Working within a department's allocated budget requires a variable workload program that allows faculty members to contribute by participating in activities that they do best. Missions and instructional pedagogies differ across departments, thus the responsibility for determining specific faculty workloads under this policy rests with the department head subject to the approval of the Dean and the Provost.

Step 1 - Determining unit responsibilities

Each department should develop a normative model as a framework for workload assignments. This normative model will reflect the following from each academic dimension:

- (1) Teaching: the number and types of students to be served, maximum and minimum class sizes, and other pedagogical considerations unique to that department;
- (2) Research: goals for grant proposal production, publications, and other creative activities;
- (3) Service: the service obligations for faculty members in that department to the department, the school or college, the university, and the external community.

Modifications should occur periodically in any or all of these dimensions as the department's needs and goals change.

Step 2 - Allocation of workload responsibilities to full-time faculty

The overall workload responsibilities within each department identified in step one are allocated in a manner that maximizes the overall productivity of the department while allowing each individual faculty member to contribute in alignment with his/her professional strengths. While no set formula for assignments of workload responsibilities can be set forth here because of the variances among departments and colleges, the following concepts are assumed:

- (1) Research-active faculty in departments will have a normal teaching assignment for that unit with the remainder of their assignments in research and service.²
- (2) Prolific researchers may have their teaching and/or service workload reduced so

² The "normal" teaching load in terms of courses might be reduced because of assignment to especially large classes or time intensive course preparations.

- that they may further the department's research mission.
- (3) When a prolific researcher has a reduced teaching responsibility and/or service responsibility - that responsibility will be assigned to another faculty member in the department that is prolific on the teaching and/or service dimension.
 - (4) It is likely that the tenured/tenure track faculty members will not be able to fulfill the entire teaching responsibility of a department. In these cases, the remaining obligations will be allocated to non-tenure track faculty, adjunct faculty and to teaching assistants consistent with all applicable policies at that department, college, and campus.

Step 3 - Faculty performance reviews

Each year, performance review data serve as the basis for merit-based salary increases and for workload assignments for the following academic year. These performance reviews should be based on the percentage weight assigned to each academic activity dimension described previously. In other words, if a faculty member has agreed to emphasize his/her teaching strengths via a relatively heavier teaching load, that faculty member should qualify for merit-based pay rewards based commensurately on his/her performance on that dimension. Similarly, the faculty member's performance in the current year on each dimension will inform the determination of that faculty member's workload allocation across the three academic dimensions for the upcoming year. It would be appropriate to institute an appeal processes for faculty members who want to review their workload assignment for the upcoming academic year.

Step 4 - Assessment of the Workload Policy

Academic departments in conjunction with college and campus instructional committees and campus academic officers should continually assess the effectiveness of the workload policy in facilitating fulfillment of the workload obligations of that department in the most efficient and effective manner. One strategy would be to assess the overall productivity of each faculty member on a three-year cycle based on the different assignments they have agreed to undertake. This avoids hasty judgments about success in new roles and allows time for faculty members to develop expertise when new skills are being developed. It also allows faculty members to amend their percentage distribution of activities, and re-align their workload as their career focus changes.

Fit and Appropriate Match

Ensuring the right fit and the appropriate allocation of duties for faculty workload considerations are important elements in creating an effective workload policy. These aspects emphasize the work that faculty members are assigned to do and serve as the basis for the annual merit evaluations. The weight given to obligations required for tenure and promotion will likely vary from subsequent assignments, which may be more flexible based on the department and college needs and the faculty member's talents.

The total workload will likely require duties at the university-wide level and at the school, college, and department levels. These units have different goals within the university-wide mission and strategic plan. Thus, faculty work assignments will vary among and even within the colleges and schools based on the college and department mission and goals.

Fairness

The fairness of assignments refers to the manner in which the workload is allocated to faculty so that they are working in areas where they have strength and professional competence and the load is equivalent even if varying from the standard teaching/research/service allocations. Equally important, the work of the department should be distributed among the faculty members based on the specific needs of the department and not just based on what the faculty member prefers to do. Transparency in reporting each faculty member's contributions to the total department workload will provide an overall picture and be used to guide the 'appropriate' activities of the department based on the overall workload.

The following functions are forms of scholarship that may be considered for the purpose of determining workload.

Instruction

Faculty who are assigned instruction as a component of their workload must demonstrate teaching excellence based on their depth of their expertise and scholarship. The following are examples of different instructional assignments: regular teaching assignments, development of innovative courses, leadership in designing new curriculum, leadership for multi-section courses, or carrying an extensive load of independent study courses, and theses or dissertations.

Research or Other Creative Scholarly Activities

Faculty members with assignments that include research, scholarship, and other creative activities should demonstrate excellence in fulfilling that obligation. The following items are examples of research or other creative scholarly activities: publication of books, articles, monographs, and other scholarly works, competitive grants and contracts, patents, distinguished consulting, juried works and exhibitions, notable creative works, plenary talks at national and international conferences, and other invited presentations (e.g., colloquium talks).

University, Professional, and Public Service

University service includes activities related to participation in shared governance and other duties that contribute to the success of the University in accomplishing its mission. This includes activities such as involvement in campus governance, leadership roles in campus committees, special consultation to academic or administrative units on campus, providing teaching or conducting workshops for members of the campus community, etc.

Professional, academic or public service may involve such items as service to professional societies, serving as an editor for professional journals, providing consultation in one's area of expertise to governmental agencies or commissions, developing strategies to attack persistent problems locally or nationally, field studies, consultation with local or state agencies, working with local high school teachers and students, etc. This type of service is applying one's special knowledge, research skills, teaching or technical expertise in areas to provide a service to the university, the local or regional community, or the nation.