Faculty Congress Task Force on
Recommendations for CLAS Faculty Workloads and Research Support
Final Report
December 2015

I. Overview

Tenure-track faculty members in Villanova's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences contribute to the University's mission in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Over the course of an academic career, the intensity of a given colleague's contributions in these areas may vary significantly. CLAS needs a workload policy that supports fluctuating forms of faculty contribution—a policy in which faculty labor in all its forms is equitably distributed, appropriately recognized, and adequately compensated. Such a policy will ensure that Villanova is able to foster lifelong learning for both students and faculty.

Villanova is at a stage of growth and change—a stage that invites us to assess our approach to faculty workloads and plan for the future. While Villanova leaders often voice pride in our dedicated and hardworking faculty, current expectations for faculty productivity in teaching, scholarship, and service create problems in terms of a) faculty morale; b) disparities between Villanova faculty workload and that of institutions at a similar level of scholarly productivity; and c) the impact of workload issues on recruitment, hiring, and retention of high quality, productive faculty members.

Ideally, the university would be positioned to provide research, technical, and scholarly expertise to the region and beyond while also strengthening its long-standing commitment to high quality undergraduate education. In each of these areas, faculty members have central roles to play, and each growth challenge is directly tied to expectations for faculty workload. A faculty workload policy that addresses the numerous demands on faculty time must consider a) the need for flexibility; b) the recognition of the importance of research, scholarly, and creative work; c) the institutional value of higher faculty visibility in local, national, and international spheres; and d) the value and emphasis that the University continues to place on all types and levels of teaching and service.

Embedded within the University administration's goal of a higher profile for Villanova is the need to support our faculty's scholarly and creative productivity. It should be evident to all concerned parties that significant research or creative activity takes sustained time to plan, implement, write, and publish/disseminate. Thus, if we are to recruit, support, and retain productive scholars and creative faculty, our faculty workload policy must be consistent with these objectives.

Synergy between teaching and scholarship requires that expectations for faculty, assignment of faculty responsibilities, and evaluation systems for faculty reflect the high value placed on both teaching and research. That is, a faculty member's teaching and research responsibilities must be balanced in a way that is conducive to high performance as a teacher-scholar. Review-and-reward systems should be aligned with this balance. At the same time, the teacher-scholar model must take into account the natural evolution of faculty members' goals over time and allow for flexibility in workloads to achieve these goals. The current review and merit system within the

College could be better aligned with the demands and expectations of the teacher-scholar model and the goals of individual faculty members, which naturally vary across one's career.

The current workload policy in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has been relatively inflexible. It is pegged to course credit hours and therefore calibrated to student, not faculty, labor. The standard teaching load is 3-3, with a one-course reduction for highly productive scholars. Teaching three courses effectively, advising students, directing student research, and participating in department, college, and university service activities comprise a full-time workload. As many faculty have observed, a one-course reduction per academic year does not create workload equity between low research-active scholars and highly research-active scholars. A highly productive scholar who is producing at a level in line with a research-oriented doctoral university currently receives the same 3-2 load as a minimally productive scholar. This system of accounting also leans toward rewarding quantity over quality with regard to publication.

Concerns about faculty workloads have recently been expressed by administration at other universities in our region. In September, Georgetown University Provost Robert Groves suggested that "it seems to be a good time to think carefully about whether Georgetown could create ways of measuring faculty workloads that more equitably and fully reflect the range of activities that faculty pursue in support of the mission of the university. Since the most precious commodity of faculty is their time, new counting rules based on their time allocation might be a starting point."[1] At Drexel University, faculty activities are determined according to a six step approach that maintains flexibility for each faculty member's strengths and each academic unit's needs.[2] As explained by Michael F. Middaugh, former Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and past Director of the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity at the University of Delaware (home of the Delaware Study of Selected Measures of Out-of-Classroom Faculty Activity, commonly referred to as the Delaware Study): "faculty do a great deal more than teach, and faculty productivity embraces a great deal more than can be captured in a 'student credit-hours taught per faculty' ratio. Colleges must consider the qualitative dimensions of out-of-classroom faculty activity, particularly in the fine arts, social sciences, and humanities, where there are little data about external support to provide context for teaching loads and instructional costs."[3]

As the Faculty Congress Task Force on Carnegie Reclassification observed in their report of May 2015, the teaching load for research-productive faculty is incommensurate with the current level of research productivity required for tenure and promotion at Villanova. We reiterate their recommendation that course-load expectations should not exceed 3-2 for anyone actively engaged in research, and a maximum of a 2-2 (or even possibly a 2-1) for highly research-productive faculty. This is commensurate with universities at our *current* level of research productivity, as the Carnegie Task Force noted: "In practice, our tenure and promotion standards for humanities faculty, for example, are now on a par with those at Tufts and Marquette, where faculty produce one scholarly monograph for tenure and a second for promotion to Full. The standard teaching load at Tufts and Marquette is 2-2, not including potential reductions for exceptionally productive scholars or for service. As a counterexample, humanities faculty at

---

[1] Source: https://blog.provost.georgetown.edu/rewarding-faculty-for-what-they-do/.
[2] Source: http://drexel.edu/provost/policies/faculty_workload.
[3] Source: http://chronicle.com/article/Measuring-Faculty/128802/

Ursinus College have a standard 3-2 (not 3-3) teaching load but with no monograph required for either tenure or promotion."

The Carnegie Task Force report observes some of the measurable effects of Villanova's imbalanced teaching and research expectations: "One illustration of work overload is that research-productive faculty in some disciplines are now spending 10+ years at the rank of Associate Professor, saddled with far heavier service burdens than they had at the rank of Assistant but with no decrease in teaching and equal—if not increased—research expectations. This is especially true in departments that bear disproportionately heavy responsibility for administering academic programs. While colleagues at peer institutions are advancing in their careers, many Villanova faculty lag behind under research standards for promotion that do not match our teaching and service loads. These circumstances not only impede promising mid-career scholars from rising to greater prominence in their fields but also make it difficult to recruit and retain faculty who have other opportunities."

Faculty are eligible to apply for promotion to full Professor four years after being awarded tenure. However, the average time it actually takes to advance from Associate to Full at Villanova is one contributor to low faculty morale, especially among female faculty, who currently comprise only 17% of all full Professors in the College of Arts and Sciences (13 women compared to 64 men). Given potentially competing home-life responsibilities (e.g. birth, child-rearing) that some women shoulder and the well-documented gender bias that persists in many areas of the academy—in funding decisions, conference invitations, publication decisions, and student evaluations—it is important for CLAS to ensure that research-active female faculty will not be further disadvantaged by heavy teaching and service loads.

It is also worth considering to what extent the number of "lifelong" Associate Professors are affecting morale. While data were not available according to length of time in rank for College faculty, there is a perception that a sizeable number of faculty have gotten stuck in their rank. We do know, however, that there are currently 103 Associate Professors, but only 77 full Professors. It is also noteworthy that 22% (17) of full Professors appear to no longer be research-active, as evidenced by teaching loads--a fact that may also be somewhat demoralizing for Assistant and Associate Professors who are gauging their likelihood of maintaining successful teaching and research records throughout their career at Villanova, as well as for the full Professors themselves, had they wished to maintain an active research record but were unable to do so given other administrative duties.

Within the context of the College's current workload policy, much of the research and creative work performed by highly productive faculty is essentially "overtime" in the sense that it is accomplished during evenings, on weekends, and during unpaid summers (see Appendix A). This means that the faculty research central to institutions of higher learning—where knowledge must not only be disseminated but created—is often, at Villanova, uncompensated labor. The fact that summer teaching is paid but summer research is not (with the exception of Summer Research Fellowships, which are limited in availability) contributes to the demoralizing sense among active scholars that when it comes to compensation, research is regarded as somehow elective or not real work. While research is required for tenure and advancement and increasingly central to the University's branding, much of it has to be done on faculty members' own time and own dime (for example, in the case of having to pay for summer child care to

perform unpaid summer research). Indeed, faculty must consistently dedicate summers to research in order to maintain the reduced 3-2 load, which means that the 3-2 often entails a significantly heavier workload than the 3-3. Time off is a form of compensation: if some faculty are working unpaid in the summers while others are not or are earning extra money through teaching, the faculty compensation system is fundamentally inequitable. Further, course remissions often function as a form of currency in academia and must be managed accordingly. Faculty with more course remissions have more time to apply for grants and to publish, which in turn may translate into funds and/or promotion.

Some faculty members do receive reductions in teaching load below a 3-2. These are typically granted in connection with the assumption of administrative duties. Although some of these reductions are appropriate, others need to be reevaluated to ensure workload equity. The time devoted to administration is not available for scholarly or creative work, and thus administrative course reductions do not address the need for supporting scholarly/creative activity. Faculty members should not have to choose between performing administrative service to the university and supporting an ongoing research agenda.

It appears that 35% (27) of full professors, 32% (33) of associate professors, and 14% (10) of untenured assistant professors in the College are receiving a greater course reduction than a 3-2. We do not know how many of these are for administrative contributions or other reasons, but it is undeniable that we have been operating in a system in which about a third of the faculty receive less than a 3-2 teaching load. Morale may be affected by the perception that some of these course reductions are awarded inequitably.

It is also important to note at the outset that not all faculty members desire to develop or maintain significant scholarly/creative programs. Villanova will continue to be a strong teaching institution where a faculty member can and should be valued for having a primary emphasis in the varied dimensions of high quality teaching. The most reasonable approach to addressing what might be considered as a clash between current workload practice and the needs/expectations associated with Villanova is to develop a flexible workload policy, as described below.

II. Principles

Based on our review of current faculty workload practices in CLAS, the Task Force has identified several key principles to structure our recommendations. These include the following:

A. Flexibility

Stated simply, the growth of the institution means increasing complexity. As we move into new projects and new programs, it is clear that a) faculty will be expected to fill a wider range of professional roles than ever before, and b) more faculty will be needed to fill roles that may differ from expectations that were appropriate in earlier years of employment. These may include undergraduate and graduate teaching; scholarly and creative productivity; program administration; grant development and management; supervision of dissertation and other student research; ongoing program development and evaluation for new and established advanced degree programs; and consultation with and service to businesses, government

agencies, educational systems. It may also include professional service in the areas of journal editing, administration of professional organizations, and conference organizing. Each of these is critical to the success of our faculty and institution, and each is time- and resource-intensive. To continue its success, CLAS will have to creatively address the diverse and complex requirements of the work associated with these demands. It would be desirable to institute workload policies that are sufficiently flexible to both encourage faculty in all of these areas and to compensate faculty labor appropriately. The aim of the flexible workload policy is to make it possible for faculty to succeed in a wide range of roles, eliminating what many experience as "invisible" labor by adequately accounting for real faculty work. By ensuring that faculty are not stretched so thinly, such a policy would enable us to serve our students better.

B. Variability in Faculty Contributions to Villanova's Objectives

Intimately tied to the need for flexibility is the importance of recognizing and rewarding the varied contributions to the institution's objectives that different faculty can make. The time-honored tripartite vision of faculty work (teaching, scholarship, service) does not necessarily require that all faculty can or should be expected to make equivalent contributions in each area. As our objectives continue to grow more complex, it will serve us to acknowledge and nurture the varied skills and interests of our faculty while also recognizing the need to integrate those interests and skills into aggregate practices that ensure the University and its programs will meet its overall goals.

C. Equity

Workload policies and practices must be fair. This necessitates a system whereby expectations are clear, reasonable, applied to all faculty members in a consistent manner (while allowing for the flexibility and variability noted above), perceived as unbiased, and appropriately tied to the professional objectives of each department. Workload distribution therefore must be transparent. Legacy teaching reductions need to be openly reevaluated in light of current workload demands, and workload distribution must be undertaken by elected committees rather than negotiated in private. Faculty who are not actively conducting research should expect an increase in teaching loads in order to create greater workload equity among all full-time tenure-track faculty. Workload equity means shared workload not only within but across departments. If a given discipline requires a greater investment of teaching time by its faculty than does another—yet maintains concomitant research expectations—that department must be empowered to increase the size of its faculty.

D. Accountability via Evaluation of Differential Responsibilities

Because faculty labor is varied, appropriate methods of evaluating differential work responsibilities must be implemented. As faculty members develop relatively higher or lower commitments to research, to teaching, or to service activities, they should be expected to document differential productivity in these areas and be evaluated, annually and triennially, in relation to that differentiated load in a manner that is perceived by faculty and administrators as appropriate and equitable.

E. Workload Tied to Demonstrable Activities

Faculty workload must, to the extent possible, be tied to specific, identifiable tasks and responsibilities rather than to more general constructs or roles. The relevant, concrete question to be addressed here becomes: what is the faculty member doing with his or her time that warrants a specific overall workload distribution? The faculty member's response to this question is to propose a set of teaching, scholarship/creative, and service activities that are in line with his or her goals while also meeting the stated needs and priorities of the department. Considered in this way, workload decisions focus on the time associated with particular work (rather than, for example, student course credit), the perceived value of that work within the framework of the unit (program, department, College), and the importance of balancing program, department, and/or College needs with the range of skills and interests of department faculty.

III. A Flexible Workload Policy

The following proposal for a workload policy is based on the principles outlined above. It is clear that the needs for and expectations of faculty vary by discipline, and thus no college-wide formula can address all workload-related variables. Ultimately, these will need to be established by individual departments in cooperation with the Dean. Nevertheless, the Task Force wants to emphasize several key points:

A. The flexible workload policy is designed to support and enhance the opportunities for faculty to work in ways that are consistent with their interests, goals, and skills while also encouraging departments to think creatively about their needs, priorities, and resources.

B. The policy is not intended to require or favor any particular set of professional skills or activities, nor should it compete with criteria for critical decisions such as tenure or promotion. Under a flexible workload policy, the University and specific departments would still articulate tenure and promotion requirements. Faculty, chairs, and the Dean would need to consider these carefully as workload plans are proposed, reviewed, and approved. The proposed policy is designed to increase flexibility in workload for both new and experienced faculty members, not to supplant or replace any minimal criteria for promotion or tenure. As always, for important decisions such as promotion and tenure, all departments must clearly define their expectations for each area of faculty responsibility such that individual faculty members, chairs, and the Dean can consider how individual workload plans will enhance or inhibit progress towards those important goals.

C. The recommended ranges of workload associated with each area of faculty responsibility— Teaching (see section VII.A), Scholarly/Creative Activities (see section VII.B), and Service (see sections VII.C, VII.D, and VII.E)—are presented as outer limits. They would not necessarily be freely available to each faculty member to simply choose or for each chair or The Dean to assign to individual faculty each year. The Task Force recommends these ranges to underscore the varying effort that is possible for faculty to engage in while still being active, productive, and valued. In addition, it is important to note the possibilities of individual exceptions to the designated ranges for each area (see section VI).

D. Over-reliance upon or significantly increased use of part-time instructors is not a desirable strategy for meeting the teaching needs that are likely to emerge from increasing flexibility in faculty work efforts. Hiring an adjunct professor as a temporary sabbatical replacement, for example, would be an appropriate use of part-time labor. However, ongoing needs should be met through the employment of full-time, not part-time, faculty. If the University is to encourage and support the range of faculty activities associated with increasing prominence in new areas, the financial support for appropriate numbers of highly qualified full-time faculty must be a central feature of the planning process.

IV. Timelines

The policy proposed here necessitates proceeding in phases. Within the first semester after the policy is adopted (e.g. Fall 2016), all departments would do an internal assessment, develop a plan, define criteria, and develop accountability expectations that will be needed in order to implement a more flexible workload. As soon as possible after that, and within one additional semester (e.g. Spring 2017), each department would develop its plan and clarify the resulting personnel-related needs to allow the greater flexibility in faculty loads, up to the maximum range for each area of faculty work included in their department's plan. At the same time, each department would begin a first phase of implementation by identifying the degree of flexibility in each area of workload that is possible for the next year. Thus, departments might be able to allow each faculty member a small amount of flexibility in one or more areas for the next year, or they might identify one or several faculty who would be allowed greater flexibility, given the needs and priorities of that department.

In year two (e.g. 2017-2018 academic year), each department would have the opportunity to refine its process and increase the range of flexibility granted to faculty. By year three (e.g. 2018-2019 academic year), the full range of flexibility (modified by departments as needed) would be operational.

V. Process

For an individualized, flexible workload policy to be most effective, there must be a broad sense of commitment, or buy-in, from the concerned parties. Thus, it will be imperative that all academic levels within the College are actively involved in the development and implementation of this policy. The Dean will need to oversee the process, ensuring that all departments participate in ways that are fundamentally equivalent across the College yet also flexible enough to meet the divergent needs of each discipline type (e.g. Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences). Funding needs will vary from department to department, and may be as little as a few additional graduate assistants or adjunct faculty or as high as a new tenure track line. In many instances, resources may simply be moved from one priority to another (conversations with a few chairs has corroborated the feasibility of this). Reducing the number of courses required for graduation would also free up faculty labor, as would capping the course load covered by full-time undergraduate tuition at 15 or 16 credits per semester.

Departments will need to develop a process whereby a) a range of acceptable workload contributions in all three workload categories is identified along with appropriate accountability indicators for all activities; b) all departments (or programs) identify their aggregate or overall

needs and priorities for faculty productivity or contributions in each category; and c) individual faculty members have meaningful opportunities to develop individual workload profiles that are consistent with both their own career development and the needs of the department and College.

The College Dean will oversee the development or refinement of the general expectations for faculty workload and of department procedures for approving workload plans and subsequent evaluations of workload contributions. Of particular concern in this regard is that the Dean ensures that all department plans include specific criteria and equitable procedures. Department plans and procedures will need to be consistent with expectations for promotion and tenure and for annual reports. They should delineate the acceptable ranges of faculty contributions in each of the major areas of responsibility, the criteria for exceptions to these established ranges, the type of activities that will be included in each category, and specific methods by which faculty members will document and/or demonstrate progress in their work in each area.

Departments have the responsibility of developing workload procedures and criteria that are clear, that provide all department members with equitable opportunities to develop and implement their workload plans, that are appropriate to their disciplines, and that are consistent with the needs of their students and programs. Departments will meet periodically to review needs and priorities for faculty contributions in teaching, research/creative activity, and service within their respective program areas. Departments will clarify how College-wide criteria for promotion and tenure are met through the department's criteria and procedures. All such clarifications or any other periodic changes to department procedures are subject to approval by the College Dean.

Individual faculty members would develop workload agreements with their departments for the next academic year. These meetings should be done prior to the submission of Fall schedules. Each workload agreement would describe the faculty member's plans regarding specific contributions in each major area (teaching, research, and service) and his/her plan to document and/or demonstrate progress or achievement in each area of effort. Plans are to be based on the department's approved procedures and criteria, its list of recognized or acceptable activities, the priorities and needs of the department, and on the acceptable range of workload effort for each major area. Department needs, however, are not to supercede a professor's workload balance.

While the workload planning and review process will occur annually, a minimum three year window or time frame will be used for proposing and evaluating progress on scholarly/creative activities; the exact period would be determined by each department. This time period should recognize the time and effort needed to develop, implement, and disseminate different types of scholarly/creative work. Within the time frame adopted, faculty members are expected to demonstrate, annually, the progress they are making on their scholarly/creative projects, particularly when such projects are the basis for modifications to workload responsibilities in other areas.

All individual faculty workload plans are to be articulated and established between faculty members and their Department Workload Committees. Each department will establish a departmentally elected Department Workload Committee of 3-5 tenured faculty members to review workload plans proposed (this would replace department evaluation committees and would not only include retrospective evaluation every triennium but also allow faculty to

establish prospective and productive workload plans annually). The department chair will have authority to approve faculty workload plans, ensuring that department teaching, scholarship, and service needs are met and that workload agreements are developed and implemented fairly across department faculty members.

The Dean will have authority to approve all faculty workload plans, ensuring that College teaching, scholarship, and service needs are met and that workload agreements are developed and implemented fairly within and across all departments. The Dean will establish a College Workload Committee (replacing the current 3-2 Committee) that will serve as the first level of appeal outside the department in any circumstances where faculty members believe that their workload plans are being treated unfairly. The College Workload Committee will also review all workload plans approved by chairs to ensure consistency, fairness, and accountability within and between departments. The College Dean will be responsible for final approval of all workload plans and for ensuring that workload policies developed by each department are equitable and enforced fairly across the College. Further, the Provost would, ideally, establish a procedure for hearing individual faculty concerns about workload decisions that are perceived by a faculty member as biased, discriminatory, or otherwise unfair and that have not been resolved through discussions at the department or College levels.

Each department retains responsibility for articulating criteria for and evaluating applications for promotion and tenure. Thus, for this policy to succeed, it is critical that these criteria and expectations be clearly communicated within the department and that individual workloads be structured so that faculty have every reasonable opportunity to meet them.

VI. Workload Range for Professional Areas of Labor

Peer institutions vary in the expected ranges of effort within each workload area (teaching, scholarship, service) that they endorse for faculty members' work plans. It appears to be typical, however, that some minimum effort in each area is required, although there may be institutions that allow for the possibility of 100% effort in just one area. Given Villanova University's needs and resources, it is unlikely that such extreme commitment to any one area of effort would be desirable or supportable, except for very unusual or special circumstances that would require careful consideration and support by the involved faculty member, chair, and Dean.

As academic departments develop their expectations associated with specific ranges of workload efforts, it will be important to recognize the interaction among different workload areas and recognition that higher or lower percentage efforts are not necessarily simply higher or lower amounts of the same activities. For example, if a faculty member's workload emphasizes teaching and devotes only 10 percent time/effort to scholarly activities, then his/her activities in scholarship cannot be expected to simply be a smaller amount of the same activities that a colleague with a 60 percent workload devoted to scholarship would be expected to do. The reason for this is that a 60 percent focus on research might be associated with major research projects and/or significant research grant activities, and would likely be tied directly to expectations for significant publication and major conference presentations. A 10 percent research commitment, on the other hand, might well be focused on research and scholarly activities such as pedagogically oriented local projects, literature or book reviews, presentations based on supervised student research, applied projects in collaboration with community

organizations, and so forth. For a faculty member with an 85 percent teaching commitment, it might be reasonable to expect significantly more in the areas of course and curricular development, supervision of student projects, advising, and/or other classroom activities than would be expected from a colleague with a 30 percent teaching load. A wide variety of workload profiles could represent significant professional contributions in activity areas that are equivalently valued by the department and College, and each faculty member would be expected to demonstrate achievement in each workload area.

The ranges provided below should be viewed as typical outer limits for faculty work. Nevertheless, there may be unusual individual situations that simply do not fit within the ranges described; these cases will need to be handled individually through discussions between the faculty member, his/her chair, the College Workload Committee, and the Dean.

The outer limits of the three workload categories are not guides to a perfect 100% workload. A cursory glance reveals that any individual could mistakenly make commitments that total more or less than 100%. Faculty, chairs and the Dean will need to attempt to ensure that tenured/tenure-track faculty plans total 100% time each year.

VII. Percentages Assigned to Faculty Work Activities

A. Teaching: 25-90%

Teaching includes a wide variety of activities, including: 1) responsibility for "standard" on-campus 3- or 4-credit courses (which vary in their time demands for many important reasons); and 2) other teaching activities, including, but not limited to: travel to teach off-campus courses, teaching labs, mentoring students on writing/laboratory/creative skills, field work and internships, course development, supervising student research, independent studies or capstone work, grading, serving as chair or committee member for theses and dissertations, integrating technology and other innovative strategies into educational efforts, etc. Providing mentorship for students (and other teaching related activities not noted here) is a time consuming activity and must be clearly recognized and "credited" in any flexible policy. In consultation with their chairs, and based on the priorities and needs established by their respective academic departments, faculty members identify a percentage of work effort to be committed to the teaching area and describe the specific activities that are components of that effort and on which they will be evaluated. As such, faculty will outline all of the teaching-related activities listed above that they will be expected to complete for a given semester, in conjunction with their chair. In this way, activities outside of credited courses are recognized as teaching work aimed at improving the educational experience for students and are counted formally as labor hours within the teaching category.

With regard to assigning weight to courses, the percentage assigned to each should vary as a function of the amount of preparation and class time expected for each course. 3-credit courses that are more time-consuming (a new course preparation, for example) may be assigned a higher percentage weight than those that are less time-consuming. The per-class percentage effort estimate should include a reasonable (as defined by the department) availability to do other work associated with teaching, such as meeting with students outside of class, holding office hours, etc. However, it must also be recognized that preparing for a larger number of courses each

week is more time-consuming than teaching multiple sections of one course. As such, preparation for three separate courses per semester would be considered to expend a greater amount of effort than the same number of courses with two preparations. To the extent that the culture within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences includes expectations for faculty to make significant, sustained contributions in scholarly and creative activities, an upper limit of 2-2 or 2-1 on faculty course load will be needed for faculty who are also held accountable for producing scholarly research during a given evaluation period.

For purposes of workload calculations, no distinction is made between undergraduate and graduate classes. Peer institutions vary widely in how they handle this issue, and the Task Force could see no clear evidence that the level of a course, in and of itself, is a factor in the amount of time needed to teach it. Depending on a number of variables such as number of students, teaching techniques employed, nature of class assignments, and out of class contact with students, any class can be very time consuming. Rather than associating workload effort with the level of the class or number of student credits, this policy associates it with specific activities (e.g. course development, travel, lab activities, frequency and intensity of interaction with students, grading load, nature of weekly preparation) that are valued by the departments and that require time to implement successfully. Of course, within some disciplines it may be clear and accepted that some types of classes are more time intensive than others, and that can be included in that department's policy.

Under normal circumstances, faculty members—even those with funded research programs—will not go below a one-course teaching load in a given semester, except in the cases of sabbatical or research leave. We believe that this is in keeping with the spirit of the College's commitment to providing students with exposure to research-active faculty.

It is important to emphasize that an individual faculty member's teaching effort consists of a variety of activities, and thus significant effort devoted to thesis supervision or independent studies should be recognized as necessary, time consuming activities that must be valued and counted in faculty work loads. For example, two faculty members may each have a 75% effort in teaching; for one, this may be accounted for by three 3-credit-hour courses, whereas for another, it may well be appropriate that 75% include two courses and supervision of a group of theses and/or senior projects (if these are not already part of a course and if these are articulated as activities that are valued by the appropriate academic department).

B. Scholarship and Creative Activities: 0-70%

Scholarly activity in the academic community frequently focuses on work such as refereed journal articles, books and book chapters, refereed conference presentations, and research grants. However, we recognize that a wide range of activities may be included in this section. For example, in the arts, creative activities can be very different than the scholarship listed above. The Task Force did not consider it within its mission to define what should and should not be included in the arena of scholarship and creative activities; it is left to the academic departments to clarify what they consider appropriate for inclusion, what types of work are expected for different percentage levels of workload effort, and how each type of contribution will be valued. Faculty will vary in their type and amount of commitment to scholarly/creative activities in relation to other areas of professional productivity; faculty can participate in different types of

scholarly or creative activity; and disciplines will have legitimate differences in the type of scholarly or creative work that they value.

Faculty members will identify a percentage of effort in the scholarly/creative activities area that is consistent with the project(s) they intend to pursue and on which they will be evaluated, based on the criteria established by each department. In this system, the larger the percentage devoted to this area, the more substantial the projects and products that would be expected. At the top end, for one example, a faculty member might have a significant external research grant requiring extensive time commitments and might be expected to produce several significant national publications and presentations over a 2-3 year period. At the lower end, the expectations would be different in terms of qualitative and quantitative dimensions. For a faculty member with 5% commitment to research, it is not reasonable to expect grants and associated multiple publications. Instead, that faculty member might continue to work on small, unfunded projects and plan to submit a proposal to a regional conference. Or, scholarship contributions might include ongoing work as a reviewer of manuscripts for a journal but not any original contributions to the literature, assuming that the academic department agrees that such review work is appropriately valued at the percentage of effort requested.

The lower end is set at 0%. For most faculty members, this level would neither be typical nor necessarily a wise choice over an extended period, given the many reasons that higher levels of ongoing activity in this area are so valuable and the importance of scholarly engagement to the teacher-scholar model. Certainly most chairs and deans would discourage faculty from such a level on a regular basis. However, any number of scenarios can be imagined wherein a faculty member might find it in his/her interest to devote virtually all professional time, for a limited period, to teaching and service activities. If that person's workload plan were approved, it would allow him/her to do so without being "penalized" for lower levels of effort in this area.

It is worth stating here that departments can and will still articulate their expectations for such decisions as promotion, tenure, and graduate faculty status; faculty members will need to be knowledgeable of these and guided/mentored in appropriate ways to meet them. Thus, if a faculty member's workload plan is approved and includes minimal scholarly or creative activity for the specified time frame, this should in no way impact the faculty member's obligations to meet specified requirements in the area of scholarly and creative activity for tenure or promotion.

On the other end of the range, the upper limit is set at 70%. The assumption made here is that while all faculty members are expected to participate continuously in teaching and service activities, faculty members might have significant projects—such as large-scale research or funded grants—that would require a very significant amount of their time for a specified period. Assuming that such an arrangement were acceptable within the department and college structure (for example, if a grant provided funding to help replace a faculty member for one or more courses during the proposed year) and that the proposed activities are within the scholarly and creative mission of the College, it would likely be in the faculty member's and the College's interest to allow and encourage higher levels of scholarly/creative commitment.

C. Administrative Service: 0-50%

Faculty members frequently fill administrative roles on campus. This work can be very time consuming, and is often rather distinct from the work expectations of all faculty members. For workload planning and for evaluation purposes as detailed in this policy, it is necessary for the many administrative roles that faculty members fill to be fully recognized. This category does not refer to the work of people with contracts designating them as administrators (e.g. deans, vice presidents); rather, this is intended for faculty members who have significant portions of their work time devoted to administrative roles. These would include department/program chairs, directors of University centers, directors of clinics and other training centers, program coordinators, Faculty Congress officers, and other roles within departments, the College, or the University for which a faculty member is responsible for overseeing people and/or programs, for collecting data and submitting reports, and/or completing other administrative tasks designated for that role. The amount of workload time devoted to these administrative roles vary from position to position; the key point for the workload policy is that this work be recognized and apportioned appropriately within the faculty members' overall workload plan. The time commitments associated with these roles must be articulated and agreed to in advance by the faculty member and his/her chair and dean and are reflected in evaluation standards.

D. Departmental, College, and University Service: 5-25%

Departmental, College, and University service includes activities in support of program, department/program, College, and University functioning that are not directly tied to teaching or research. Typically these include service on committees at all levels of the institution as well as special assignments or projects within any level of the institution.

Departmental, College, and University service is a basic element of being a faculty member. Since no academic department or faculty governance structure can function without service from faculty, a minimum of 5% effort in this area is established. On the other end of the spectrum, there are faculty members who are extremely committed to institutional service activities and who are asked to make major contributions in those roles. We see it as important to the University and to faculty with such skills to encourage high quality service roles and recognize and reward them while ensuring that there is a healthy rotation of faculty through these roles, so as to avoid prolonged periods of time in which one individual dedicates extensive time to (and is potentially overburdened by) service activities. Naturally, these efforts need to be very clearly defined. The department and College would need to recognize and support the value of the service roles being proposed, and the faculty member's work in that area would then be subject to evaluation procedures aligned with these efforts and established by the department, just as it is in other areas. This is particularly imperative given imbalances in service expectations and/or commitments for women and faculty of color, among others who are underrepresented in some departments or at the University.

E. Professional Service: 0-25%

This category includes all types of service to one's professional discipline, such as journal editorship; editorial board membership; book/manuscript/grant reviewing; membership on committees of professional organizations; leadership roles or other contributions to local, state or national agencies; special consulting roles to professional groups; discipline-specific community involvement; and other activities as defined by the departments. As with administrative service

(C., immediately above), the amount of workload time devoted to professional service can vary from position to position, depending on a variety of factors. The key points remain that this work should be recognized and apportioned appropriately within the faculty members' overall workload plan, that the time commitments associated with these roles must be articulated and agreed to in advance by the faculty member and his/her chair and dean, and that they are reflected in evaluation standards.

VIII. Scholarship Support

While flexible and equitable workloads and appropriate faculty workload planning will contribute significantly to faculty performance in the area of scholarly achievement, re-evaluation of teaching and service loads is not the only means of supporting an active and vibrant scholarly community at Villanova University. A variety of other mechanisms can be put into place and current mechanisms can be enhanced that will allow faculty to more readily achieve their scholarship and creative activity goals. The Task Force also felt it was important to address the needs of faculty who may want to reinvigorate their scholarly activities, which may have decreased due to heavy teaching or service loads, difficulty in obtaining external funding, changing career goals over time, or personal circumstances. Key areas for consideration relating to scholarship support include:

A. Sabbatical Duration and Frequency

The current sabbatical system allows for a one-semester paid sabbatical (100%) in every seventh year of service. Adopting a more flexible sabbatical policy at Villanova would allow faculty to pursue additional lines of research, participate in more collaborative activities, or enhance existing scholarly activities. The Task Force proposes the following, to enhance the current sabbatical system:

    i. Sabbatical Frequency

    For faculty with significant scholarly achievements, a petition for a one-semester sabbatical could be made to the College after six semesters of service. The definition for "significant scholarly achievements" would be consistent with those policies in place within the department or program for allocation of workload effort. Alternatively, high-achieving faculty can petition for a full-year sabbatical (at 100% salary) after 12 semesters of work.

    ii. Sabbatical Duration

    A number of faculty spend the summers engaged in scholarly activities, including mentoring of students, yet are uncompensated for these activities. In many instances, due to the current teaching loads during the semester, this is the *only* time that significant progress can be made to advance their scholarship—progress that needs to be made in order to become tenured, earn promotion, or maintain a teaching load that enables them to be productive scholars. This devotion of summer hours to scholarship also precludes these same faculty from paid summer teaching, placing an even greater financial burden on them compared to their colleagues who have less scholarly activity or who can devote time to summer teaching. While some faculty have been able to secure summer funding to support their

activities, the vast majority of Villanova faculty perform these duties essentially for free. In those cases where faculty have worked uncompensated for six summers (with adequate evidence of said work in the form of scholarly achievement, students mentored, and so forth), then in the seventh year sabbatical, these faculty members can petition to be granted a full year sabbatical at 100% salary, rather than one semester. Given that a petitioning faculty member worked uncompensated for two months across six summers, in essence, Villanova benefited from over one year of free labor. This sabbatical compensation model would only ask for 4.5 months of compensation in return.

iii. Research Semesters

One challenge of faculty who strive to maintain an active research/creative program is the relative inflexibility in workload distribution, thus making it difficult to take advantage of moments of opportunity (e.g., opportunities to collaborate on timely research projects, time to write a grant proposal when a last-minute funding call is announced, or time to finish a nearly-completed book manuscript). For faculty who have had waning research activity and thus have heavy teaching loads, it is also difficult to find time to devote to reinvigoration of their scholarly activities. We propose a program whereby faculty can be granted (through a proposal/application process to the department and College) a one-semester "research semester" to take advantage of opportunities such as those mentioned above, or for those who want to reinvigorate their research program. This would not be viewed as a sabbatical: the faculty member would still be expected to have a significant presence on campus, to fulfill existing service activities, to participate in department meetings, and so forth. The teaching load would be eliminated for that one semester (and not merely pushed to a double-load the following semester). Much like the current sabbatical application, the petition for a research semester would need to indicate what specific activities would be undertaken, why the need for a unique research semester is required, the timeline for work, and the projected outcomes of the work. Should the faculty member not fulfill the requirements/outcomes of the semester, he or she would be ineligible to apply for future research semesters for 3 years. In the instance in which a faculty member fails to accomplish what he/she had agreed to do during the research semester, it might be possible that the courses would have to be "paid back" over several semesters.

B. Research "Flex Account"

Faculty who have been successful in securing external funding have traditionally seen a portion of their indirect costs returned to them in an unrestricted "4" account. This practice is highly valuable and should be continued. Policies that require faculty to give up a portion of this fund are detrimental to the compensation model, will disincentivize already highly time-consuming proposal-writing activities and should be avoided. The Task Force proposes an expansion of the existing model to include other means of research support, in addition to return of indirect costs to PIs. As mentioned above, many faculty work significant hours in the summer months to advance their scholarly activities. For those who choose to not pursue more frequent or extended duration sabbaticals, alternative compensation should include a research "flex account." This account will accrue credits over time that can be banked indefinitely and used to support scholarly activities. Credits would be granted for any number of currently uncompensated activities, including summer scholarly activity, summer student mentoring, service that was not

accounted for in the workload plan, and academic year research student mentoring that goes above a faculty member's proposed workload distribution as described in section 7. Credits accrue over time and can be used by faculty members for support that would help advance their scholarship. Such support would include graduate assistants, summer salary, equipment dollars, course release, additional travel funds to attend a scholarly conference or workshop, etc. The exact nature of the credit accrual and dollar-cost equivalent would need to be determined in consultation with the College Dean.

C. Faculty Mentoring

While different departments and programs may have both formal and informal mentoring in place, it is clear that not all faculty members have access to a helpful and well-defined support network as they advance through the tenure and promotion process. This is particularly problematic at the Associate Professor level, where a "sink or swim" attitude is generally pervasive. Assistant Professors in many departments are protected from heavier service burdens, in an effort to support them as they progress toward tenure, with much of that burden falling to Associate Professors who are themselves trying to maintain scholarly productivity to achieve promotion to Full, all the while shouldering heavier teaching and service burdens than they had prior to tenure. This results in a vicious cycle of decreased productivity (and thus increased teaching loads due to the current 3-3 vs 3-2 system) and Associate Professors who remain at this rank for a decade or more. Thus, the Task Force proposes two distinct mentoring programs be put into place across the College: pre-tenure mentoring and Associate Professor mentoring. Pre-tenure mentoring should obviously be focused on the tenure process, while Associate mentoring should be focused on a longer-term goal and career path (aiming for promotion to Full). The exact nature of a faculty mentoring program should be determined at the level of the department/program, but a number of excellent mentoring program examples are available from the University of Pennsylvania, Emory University (Passages Program), UC San Diego, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We suggest that a College-wide conversation regarding the need for formal mentoring needs to take place at Villanova sooner rather than later.

D. Improve Support Mechanisms to Secure External Funding

Faculty who strive to secure external funding to support their scholarship do so essentially on their own time. Very little reward or recognition is currently given to the work required to secure external funding. Given the currently low funding rates and the contraction of government and private foundation funding sources, it is not uncommon for a faculty member to need to write 10 grant proposals just to get one funded. This level of effort should be given greater weight in triennial reviews, in tenure and promotion cases, and in annual merit/salary reviews. Additionally, the burden of satisfying ever increasing compliance regulations (export control regulations, conflict of interest training, IRB requirements, etc.) has fallen to the faculty member, with little support to help faculty navigate the increasingly complex regulatory environment. New policy is often quickly put in place with little faculty input as to what would be the most effective way to implement necessary changes. Yet, in some cases, faculty are burdened with policies that are inflexible and hinder proposal submission and grant administration. An office of research support and administration should be supportive and work with faculty to ensure their ability to successfully apply for and administer research grants. The office should be viewed as a partner in the process—not an additional administrative hurdle to surmount in the search for

external funding. Existing resources within the College (particularly the new addition of Lyla Kaplan) are necessary and appreciated, and efforts to support and expand the ability of faculty to secure external funding should continue.

E. Administrative Assistance

Many faculty are concerned that time they use performing clerical tasks takes away from time that could be spent doing meaningful work. Faculty time is spent reserving campus rooms for events and classes, coordinating administrative functions with particular campus offices like Learning Support Services and the Office of Undergraduate Students, photocopying student exams and assignments, and submitting expense reports. Some departments have their administrative assistants help faculty with these responsibilities, while others do not. And in some departments, administrative assistants help some faculty but not all. To enhance time for teaching and research, it would be useful to have a College-wide policy expanding the duties of administrative assistants to encompass these activities and to make the assistance consistent for all departments. An expanded undergraduate work-study program could not only provide enhanced office support for faculty but increase student contact with faculty and integrate students more fully in the work of their home departments.

F. Retain Productive Faculty

Part of supporting a robust scholarship culture in the College is retaining our productive faculty who may be recruitment targets of other universities. We recommend that a procedure be implemented to facilitate efforts to retain research-active faculty at the Associate and Full professor levels—one that includes making strong counter-offers to faculty who are being recruited elsewhere.

Appendix A
Current Workload Distributions: Four Examples

Below are four examples of current distributions of faculty workload in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Teaching hours represent total hours spent per week on all teaching tasks, including class preparation, class time, course development, out-of-class student meetings, course-related lab time, mentoring of students in labs, grading or commenting on student work, and work on undergraduate and graduate theses and independent studies.

The aim of a flexible workload policy is to reduce the amount of what faculty perceive as "invisible" or uncredited labor to the University and to create systems whereby labor is distributed more equitably among faculty and faculty are compensated for all forms of labor, whether through monetary compensation or through other forms of credit, such as more frequent sabbaticals.

Examples

Professor A is an Associate Professor in a natural science discipline with a 3-2 course load. She is a highly productive scholar who works 11 months of the year on a 9-month contract. She works an average of 54 hours per week during the academic year. During two months of the summer, she works an average of 40 hours per week, 100% research. She currently has a grant that pays ½ month of summer salary; as a result Professor B has worked 1.5 months each summer uncompensated = 1.5 / 9 = 17% additional effort. Based on a 40-hour week and a 9-month contract, her labor distribution is as follows:

Academic Year (9 months)	Summer (2 months)	Workload Distribution
26 hours/week teaching on average (Courses+lab student mentoring)		65% teaching
18 hours/week research (Lab time + writing)	40 hours/week research	62% research
10 hours/week service (university, profession, community)		25% service =

135% total (academic yr)
152% total (w/ summer)
157% total (if all of summer
            were uncompensated)

Professor B is an Associate Professor in a humanities discipline with a 2-2 course load. He is an inactive scholar with a 2-course reduction for administrative service. He works an average of 31 hours per week during the academic year and does not work during the summer except to pick up extra teaching, for which he is paid additionally. Based on a 40-hour week and a 9-month contract, his labor distribution is as follows:

Academic Year (9 months)	Workload Distribution
22 hours/week teaching (4 preps/year, writing intensive)	55% teaching
7 hours/week service	18% service
0 hours/week research	0% research =
	73% total

Professor C is an Assistant Professor in a social science discipline with a 3-2 course load. He is a highly productive scholar who works 12 months of the year on a 9-month contract. He works an average of 60 hours per week during the academic year. During three months of the summer, he works an average of 40 hours per week, 100% research. As a result Professor C has worked 3 months each summer uncompensated = 3 / 9 = 33% additional effort. He is also in a program which requires a greater level of service than many academic programs on campus. Based on a 40-hour week and a 9-month contract, his labor distribution is as follows:

Academic Year (9 months)	Summer (2 months)	Workload Distribution
24 hours/week teaching on average (Indep study & thesis mentoring)		60% teaching
16 hours/week research	40 hours/week research	65% research
15 hours/week service (univ, profession, community)		38% service=
		138% total (academic yr) 163% total (w/ summer)

Professor D is an Associate Professor in a humanities discipline with a 3-2 course load. She is a highly productive scholar who works 11 ½ months of the year on a 9-month contract. She works an average of 52 hours per week during the academic year. During two and a half months of the summer, she works an average of 40 hours per week, 100% research. Based on a 40-hour week and a 9-month contract, her labor distribution is as follows:

Academic Year (9 months)	Summer (2 ½ months)	Workload Distribution
30 hours/week teaching (5 preps/year, writing intensive)		75% teaching
16 hours/week research	40 hours/week research	60% research
6 hours/week service		15% service = 155% total