

May 7, 2020

To: Executive Vice-Chancellor Elizabeth H. Simmons,
Chair of San Diego Divisional Academic Senate, Maripat Corr

From: Senate-Administrative Workgroup on Faculty Workload

Re: Response to the supplemental charge to the Workload Workgroup

This memo is in response to the Senate's supplemental charge to the Workgroup to develop more standardized and consistent campus guidelines on service expectations and to develop guidelines to better advise departments on how to account for the work of their faculty. The Workgroup also considers the feasibility of inspiring certain teaching practices and correcting some current practices including service falling disproportionately on women and faculty of color.

As requested, the Workgroup provides in Table 1 in the Appendix a concise summary of the departmental responses to key questions in the survey conducted in the winter of 2019. Also, from the same survey, the Workgroup has shared previously the following overarching observations:

- There is no universal standard for teaching and service workload across UC San Diego. Some departments count courses, others student credit units, and differential credit levels may be accrued for shared instruction of a class. Also, some School of Medicine teaching occurs in clinical settings and through teaching small portions of a course
- Most departments have teaching load standards that are known by faculty, and in some cases also clearly articulated in formal policies
- The teaching load for LRF varies across divisions, and in some cases within division. The range is typically from 2-4 courses annually (or sometimes up to 5 in Arts and Humanities). The teaching load for LSOEs is typically 6 courses per year across the campus.
- There are very few online courses being offered on campus.
- In all departments, expectations for service vary by rank, with junior faculty expected to do much less service than senior faculty, particularly service at the campus level.
- An example of Best Practice: The Division of Biological Sciences has implemented a Divisional Education Committee, which includes Faculty and Teaching Professors from each of the four sections and oversees adherence to detailed standards that ensure equity in teaching loads.

From these observations, the Workgroup recommends: (1) Departments should maintain a transparent record of individual faculty members teaching load, approved teaching relief and how this relates to department standards. (2) Modifications to teaching workload standards should document current expectations and provide rationale for proposed changes.

The Workgroup reconvened on March 19, 2020 and came up with additional recommendations:

1. Departments/units are advised to promote best practices in teaching and service, and publish guidelines annually on faculty workload so all faculty know in advance how to plan their academic schedule.
2. Best practices aim to make the workload information as publicly available as possible to help with equity issues. One such best practice is to publish who is teaching what, and who is serving on which committees, most conveniently, in a table format. By promoting transparency through best practices, faculty have access to their colleagues' teaching and service activities and will be empowered to better understand current practices and inequities. In principle, there should be equal relief or remuneration for equal departmental service. The practice of transparency could also empower deans and chairs to intervene, as well as support Faculty proposals for change, should inequity occur.
3. Transparency in teaching workload also aims at getting and communicating the source information for current practice to faculty. Departments/units could state explicitly how faculty teaching workload is accounted for, e.g. number of students in the course, first time teaching, etc., and how it is managed, e.g. preference for lower division versus upper division versus graduate course assignment as well as course designation for course buyout, sabbatical leave, teaching relief due to administrative role and service, and so on. Ad hoc teaching release should be avoided; permanent teaching load reduction (for example as part of a retention package) should not be allowed.
4. Equitable distribution of service can be challenging, particularly in the assessment of faculty advancement files in terms of the time and effort involved. Academic Senate should avoid policies and practices that can add to the inequity. For instance, Committee on Committees (CoC) should avoid asking the same people over and over to fill committees in order to ensure diversity, representation, or competence on committees. Furthermore, updated information about the workload levels of standing Senate Committee service should be shared directly with departments/units. Likewise, the departments should share with CoC compiled tables documenting service commitments of their faculty. Appropriate onboarding of committee members should establish clear expectations for the effort needed. All these efforts can serve as exemplary practices for departments/units to prevent inequity in workload; they can also motivate them to establish similar transparent practices for service at the departmental level. Continued distribution of service by ranking, in particular minimizing the service load for younger ladder rank faculty, would be welcomed practices to uphold.
5. Service transparency at the departments/units. Department leadership could ask faculty to document how much time and effort they have put in when they serve on committees which include administrative, departmental and campus-wide ones as well as ad hoc workgroup, taskforce and mentoring, which the department can publish annually.
6. The current crisis caused by COVID-19 can serve as a case study for faculty workload. This is an example where certain faculty have carried significant added load and helped the campus in transitioning to remote classrooms. Others have not yet been obligated to contribute.

Respectfully,

Paul Yu, Provost, Revelle College (co-Chair)
 Tara Hutchinson, Structural Engineering (co-Chair)
 Catherine Constable, Chair and Deputy Director, IGGP/SIO
 Robert Continetti, Senior AVC, Academic Affairs
 Amanda Datnow, Associate Dean, Social Sciences
 Judith Dolan, Professor, Theatre and Dance
 Peter Ebenfelt, Associate Dean, Physical Sciences
 David Gutierrez, Senior Associate Dean, Arts and Humanities
 Juan Lasheras, Professor, MAE
 Craig McKenzie, Professor, Rady School of Management
 John Moore, Dean, Undergraduate Education
 Piyush Patel, Professor, Anesthesiology
 Pamela Ratcliff, Chair, History
 Andrew Scull, Professor Sociology
 Elina Zuniga, Professor, Molecular Biology

Appendix. Table I. Summary of the survey conducted in Winter 2019

Division/ Department	Is teaching load standardized? Are class size/lab, G/UG considered?	Clear criteria for teaching relief existed? Relief for service?	Are there service expectations? Do they vary by rank?	Online courses offered? If yes, do they count toward workload?	Is cross-departmental teaching allowed? Counted for workload?	Any mechanism to mitigate workload imbalance?	Are there processes to modify workload standards?	Notes/Comments
<i>Arts and Humanities</i>								
History	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y*/Y	N/	Y/Y	Y	Y	*Requested bonus-off-scale for excellent service
Literature	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	N	Y*	*Request not successful
Music	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	Y	Y	
Philosophy	Y/Y	N/N*	N/Y	N/	Y/Y	Y	Y	*Relief only for major dept service
Theatre and Dance	Y/Y	N/N*	Y/Y	N/	Y/N**	N	N	*Relief only for 2 roles ** Has one exception
Visual Art	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y*	N	N	*May stop counting as workload soon
<i>Social Sciences</i>								
Anthropology	Y/Y	N*/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y**	Y	Y	*Accept only course buyout **Faculty teach in many other programs

Cognitive Science	Y/	Y/N*	Y/Y	N/	?	Y	Y	*Accept only course buyout ? Did not address
Communication	Y/Y	Y/N*	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	Y	Y	*Relief for 2.33 roles
Economics	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y*	N	Y**	*Reciprocity required **Course reduction allowed by Admin
Education Studies	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/Y	Y/Y	Y/N	N*	N	*Discussion in progress
Ethnics Studies	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	Y*	Y	*Small dept size
Linguistics	Y/N	Y/N*	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	N	N	*Relief only for 3 roles
Political Science	Y/Y	Y/N*	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	N	N	*Relief only for 3 roles
Psychology	Y/Y	N/N*	Y/Y	Y/N	Y/N	N	N	*Case-by-case; relief for chair and Senate roles
Sociology	Y/Y	N/N*	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	N	N	* Relief only for 2 roles
<i>Physical Sciences</i>								
Chem/Biochem	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/N*	Y	Y	* Do not count outside teaching
Mathematics	Y/N	Y/Y	?/Y	N/	Y/N*	N	N	? Did not address *Consider case-by-case
Physics	Y/Y	Y/N*	Y/Y	N/	Y/N	N	N	*Buyout for admin roles; relief only for a few roles
<i>Engineering</i>								
BioEngineering	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	N/Y*	N	Y	*Provided dept instruction needs are met
CSE	Y/Y	N/N*	Y/Y	Y/N	N/	N	N	*Relief only for a few roles
ECE	Y*/Y	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	N	Y	*Standards internal to dept
MAE	Y/Y	Y*/N	Y/Y	N/	N/N	Y	N	*Accept only course buyout
NanoEngineering	Y/Y	Y/N*	Y/Y	Y/Y	N/N	N	Y	*Relief only for a few roles
Structural Eng.	N*/Y	N/Y**	Y/Y/	N/	N/N	N	N	*In consideration **Relief only for 3 roles
<i>Biological Sciences</i>								
SIO	Y/N	Y/N*	N/Y	Y/N	Y/N	N	Y	*Relief only for key SIO admin roles
GPS	Y/Y	N/N*	Y/Y	N/	Y/Y	N	N	*Relief only for a few roles
Rady	Y/N*	N/N**	Y/Y	N/	Y/N	N	N	*Consider case-by-case **Relief for admin roles
<i>Health Sciences</i>								
Anesthesiology	N/N	N/N	Y/N	N/	Y/Y	N	N	
Family Medicine & Public Health	Y/N	Y*/N	Y/Y	N/	Y/N	Y	N	*Burnout Prevention
Pathology	N*/N	N/N	Y/N	N/	Y/Y	N	N	*Required teaching for advancement
Surgery	N*/N	N/N	Y/N	N/	Y/	N	N	**Required teaching for advancement