

---

## **GUIDELINES FOR WORKLOAD ALLOCATION AND EVALUATION FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS**

---

### 1 Background

One of the charges for the University's Faculty Performance Evaluation Task Force that reported in June 2010 was to develop guidelines reflecting the fact that teaching, research, and service loads may vary from faculty member to faculty member. The Task Force proposed a comprehensive revision to University Rule 12.01.99 M2 (University Rule on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). Section 2.5.3 of the proposed rule reads:

2.5.3 Annual reviews must embrace the position that faculty members' relative degrees of focus on teaching, service, and research or other creative contributions may change as their careers evolve. At times, it is appropriate for faculty members to contribute in a balanced way to all three facets of faculty contribution. At other times, it may be appropriate for a given faculty member to focus on research/creative contribution, and at still other times it may be appropriate for that faculty member to focus on teaching or service.

There has been a long record in the College of Liberal Arts of setting differential workloads, as occurs also in a number of other Colleges at Texas A&M. However, this practice has not been either systematic or transparent. Accordingly, at the College of Liberal Arts Executive Council meeting on 30 August 2011 the Council asked the Dean to prepare for further discussion a document setting out guidelines for faculty workload allocations in the light of the Task Force report.

### 2 Basic principles

The guidelines in section 3 are informed by the following basic principles:

- 2.1 Departmental workload allocations and performance evaluations should be based upon a standard balance between the three responsibilities of every faculty member – teaching, research, and service.
- 2.2 The default position is that all faculty members will teach the standard load for their department. There are separate policies governing course reductions, course buyouts, departmental leaves, etc. There will not typically be lowered teaching loads except as authorized by one of those policies.
- 2.3 The standard teaching load for each department is based on the assumption that each faculty member is research-productive and makes a service contribution to the running of the department.

- 2.4 When faculty members are not research-productive, considerations of equity require that they increase their teaching and/or service loads in order to maintain approximately comparable workloads across the department.
- 2.5 There needs to be a transparent process in place at the departmental level for identifying lack of research-productivity and for adjusting teaching and/or service loads in order to preserve workload equity. This process should be initiabile both by the faculty member and by the department head.
- 2.6 Faculty members who take on greater teaching and/or service loads will still be able to be rewarded through the merit pay process for meritorious performance.
- 2.7 No revision is envisaged to the college guidelines for promotion to full professor.

### 3. Guidelines

These guidelines are only applicable to tenured faculty, as performance expectations for tenure-track faculty members are discussed in other university, college, and departmental documents.

- 3.1 Any tenured faculty member may raise with their department head the possibility of altering their performance expectations in the light of how their career has evolved.
- 3.2 The topic of altering performance expectations may also be raised by a department head if it is thought that a tenured faculty member has not been significantly research-productive. The annual review process would be an obvious place to begin this discussion. Department heads are ultimately responsible for fixing the workloads of individual faculty members, and for determining how productive a faculty member has been. But it is hoped that conversations about research-productivity will be approached as part of a constructive dialog about career trajectory. Relevant departmental bodies be involved as appropriate.
- 3.3 Decisions about lack of research-productivity should never be based upon a faculty member's research area, or on any consideration besides the quantity, quality, and impact of published outputs (where this is understood broadly to include creative performances and artistic works).
- 3.4 It is recommended that individual department heads codify their expectations for significant research productivity in terms of quantity, quality, and impact of published outputs, in consultation with the appropriate bodies within their departments.
- 3.5 Assessments of lack of significant research productivity do not require, and will not automatically lead to, a process of post-tenure review. Indeed, altering performance expectations may remove the need for post-tenure review (as defined in University Rule 12.06.99.M1).

- 3.6 Lack of engagement in appropriate departmental service, or poor performance in service roles, may also lead to alterations in performance expectations
- 3.7 Altering performance expectations will typically involve two adjustments:
- First, an adjustment in the faculty member's workload, involving an increase in teaching and/or service load
  - Second, an adjustment to the respective weights assigned to research, teaching, and service in the faculty member's performance evaluation.
- 3.8 It is normal for departments to accommodate increased service loads through reductions in teaching and/or summer compensation (when the position involves summer duties). Taking on an increased service load with a teaching reduction would not balance out a lack of research-productivity. However, any duties performed outside the nine-month academic year should be compensated appropriately.
- 3.9 Some departments in Liberal Arts allocate weights to teaching, research, and service in the performance evaluation. As Texas A&M is a research-intensive University there should never be a zero weight assigned to research in a faculty member's performance evaluation. The exact weight should be determined by the department head in consultation with the faculty member, but it is recommended that there be a minimum threshold of 20% and that merit weights for research for faculty with increased teaching assignments should be at least 10% lower than the standard. Departments that do not assign numerical weights should ensure that these basic principles are respected.
- 3.10 Faculty members who have altered their performance expectations should remain eligible for the merit pool and other comparable forms of compensation and recognition. Performance should be evaluated exactly as for other faculty, the only difference being the relative weights assigned to teaching, research, and service.
- 3.11 The adjustments described in 3.7 should normally be set in place for a fixed period (three years is suggested), and be reviewed at the end of that period. Department heads, in consultation with the faculty member, should identify in advance the conditions under which those adjustments will be continued, reversed, or further modified.