

**Academic Policy Committee Report -PART II
(DRAFT)
Spring 2020**

Committee Members: Jack Dennerlein (Bouvé), Deb Franko (Provost's Office), David Herlihy (CAMD), Robert McOwen (COS), Enrique Moreno (COS), Harvey Shapiro (CPS)

Charge 3: In collaboration with the Provost's Office, the APC shall provide a review of the effectiveness of the workload policy implementation (e.g. whether all units field a policy, whether all units executed the policy as filed, whether the policies impacted associated merit reviews).

Process: We decided that we could use the Chair's Forum that Deb Franko convenes to circulate a short survey to the 45 departments at NU. We created a four question survey:
Question 1: Did you implement your approved workload policy for the 2019-20 academic year? Please describe in a few sentences how you did so and whether done at a time of merit review or otherwise.

Question 2: Did the workload policy impact the merit review process? If so, how?

Question 3: How well are the elements of the workload policy translating into practice in your unit?

Question 4: Any additional comments about the workload policy?

Findings:

We had 35 responses from the 45 departments.

Objective Data: We were able to obtain objective answers to the first part of Q1 and Q2.

This is what we found:

Q1: Did you implement your approved workload policy for the 2019-20 academic year?

Yes: 32, No: 3.

Q2: Did the workload policy impact the merit review process?

Yes: 24, No: 10, ?: 1.

But the answers to Q2 were mixed in cases where there was no change or the workload policy had been previously implemented: some answered "No", others answered "Yes". For example, one Chair wrote: "Not really...the merit process was already based on a solid pre-existing workload policy."

Qualitative Data: Here are some summary conclusions and sample quotes.

Q3: Most said "well" or "adds clarity". But some said "too early to tell."

- "The Workload Policy provides clear guidelines for different types of full-time faculty and the criteria for any modifications of workloads."
- "It doesn't change our day-to-day functioning much, but does allow for more oversight into equitable distribution of responsibilities, mainly through the specified teaching load."
- "Not positive yet. Too soon to tell."

Q4: Half said nothing; the other half commented on the difficulty of generalizing workload policy across all faculty.

- "The policy for us is very general and is hard to apply to program with non-traditional

course structure, but it has been sufficient so far.”

- “It is more difficult to track workload for interdisciplinary faculty and make sure that service expectations match appointment. This becomes problematic when units in different colleges do not properly track service (or have very different policies) for faculty coming up for tenure or promotion.”
- “The biggest challenge with the workload policy is that it is hard to write a policy that anticipates all of the unusual situations that can arise. Workload policies nicely articulate standard expectations and the most common variations, but as our curriculum structure, service needs, and faculty roles change over time, they put a lot of pressure on the policy. The workload policy may therefore need to be continually revisited.”
- “I am wondering if, moving forward, it might be possible for non-TT faculty to have a different breakdown from the 80-20 split between teaching and service/professional development. Otherwise, it is difficult to ask colleagues to do much needed service for the unit.”

Recommendations:

We recommend that a full faculty survey be conducted next academic year on faculty satisfaction with the workload policy implementation in their unit.