Faculty Workload

and

Rewards Policy
I. Overview

The purpose of this document is to serve as the School of Computing an Information Systems policy on Faculty Workload and Rewards, used for both personnel evaluation and when developing individualized workload plans. This document is intended to be compliant with the faculty handbook at Grand Valley State University, section on General Personnel Policies. The faculty handbook supersedes this evaluation document. This document was formally adopted by the Computer Science and Information Systems Department in January, 2003, and revised by the School of Computing and Information Systems (hereinafter referred to as the School) in July, 2008.

II. Individualized Workload Components

A. Overview

Each School of Computing and Information Systems faculty member is required to maintain an annual academic year workload of 24 credits. The minimum workload requirements for each faculty are to teach 18 credits per academic year and demonstrate baseline expectations of scholarship and service to the University and community. Additionally, a School of CIS faculty member must propose up to 6 credits per academic year of additional teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Note: this document contains several bulleted lists. In each case these are meant to be suggestive, but not necessarily complete. All regular faculty members, whether full- or part-time, shall be evaluated on the same criteria and shall be expected to demonstrate that they meet the same level of performance expectations. In personnel actions the burden of proving that their performance warrants the personnel action under consideration rests with the faculty member to be reviewed. It is the University's responsibility to process the requested personnel action. While each of the criteria listed below must be demonstrated to some degree, the primary responsibility of the faculty is effective teaching.

B. Baseline Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

1. Teaching

Recognizing the subjective nature of determining teaching effectiveness, the School’s evaluations criteria includes, but is not limited to:

- Normal class load – 9 credits/ semester or maximum of 18 credits/academic year
- Maintaining up to date course documents (syllabi, exams, etc.)
- Holding a reasonable number of office hours, this may include scheduled office hours, on-line office hours, Blackboard discussion groups, etc.
- Student academic and professional advising
- Demonstration of currency in course content
- Demonstration of currency in teaching methods
- Maintaining effective and up-to-date teaching materials

A significant pro-active pattern of other baseline activities, such as a selection of those listed below indicates that the individual is making a continuous effort to improve their teaching effectiveness.

1.1 Baseline Activities

- Discussions with fellow faculty on successful and unsuccessful classroom techniques, examples, assignments, test questions, and classroom management styles.
- Participation in FTLC activities.
- Revisions to courses and course material in response to student feedback.
- Preparation of high quality class materials, for example, lab exercises, overhead transparencies, and multi-media presentations.
- Lecture exchanges.
- Projects or topics that relate to two (or more) courses.
- Mentoring student projects, research, honors projects, etc.
- Special attention to advanced (and to struggling) students.
- Availability (and willingness) to help all students. This might require flexible office hours.
- Revisions to courses and course material in response to changing technology. (This is particularly important to the School.)
- Occasional off-campus speakers.
- Experimentation with alternative (to lecture/listen) teaching techniques.
- Voluntary peer evaluations.

1.2 Assessment and Evaluation Activities
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For all levels of rank the guidelines shown in section 1.1 give an acceptable level of activity within this area. Specifically, for an Instructor, limited teaching experience is assumed, and teaching development expected. For an Assistant Professor, some teaching experience is assumed, and teaching effectiveness is expected. For an Associate Professor, five full time equivalent years at the rank of an Assistant Professor is assumed, and demonstrated competence is expected. For a Professor, seven full time equivalent years at the rank of an Associate Professor is assumed, and demonstrated consistent excellence in teaching is expected. For all levels of ranks (Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Professor) the School expects the teacher to demonstrate effectiveness in the profession of teaching, which can be accomplished by demonstrating the following pro-active choices in their teaching. The following items are all considered factors in evaluating teaching effectiveness.

- Formal classroom evaluations performed by the School personnel committee.
- Self-assessment by faculty member.
- Course materials
- Student evaluations

2. Scholarship
All faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly activity whose outcomes are shared with peers or broader audiences. A pattern of baseline activities, such as a selection of the items below, is expected of all regular faculty members.

- Membership and activity in professional societies
- Participation in computing education or technical conferences
- Regular readings of new appropriate technical literature
- Participation in University supported discussion groups
- Textbook evaluation and reviews
- Conference and journal paper reviews
- Evaluation of new systems or software

3. Service
A documented pattern of professional service to the School, University, and community is expected of all faculty members, to include baseline activities such as a selection of the items below.

- Student Advising
- School of CIS committee participation, full School meetings, program meetings, Academic Review, etc.
- Other service activity to the profession, School, College, University, or community

C. Example Activities that can be used for a three (3) credit workload reassignment

1. Teaching
   - Teaching 3 additional credits/semester, with a maximum 12 credits/semester

2. Scholarship
   According to the faculty handbook, scholarship includes, but is not limited to, professional research, creative activities, scholarly writing, scholarly presentations at conferences, participation in professional activities, degrees and continued education, and holding official positions in professional organizations. We value each of the following categories as they are recognition of technical expertise, contribute to the reputation of both the School and the University, promote our graduates, and provide important feedback to the classroom.

   The School identifies several activities as forms of scholarship: scholarly activity, professional development, solicitation of grants (and other forms of external support), publication, and consultation. The School also values things like the amount of creativity or originality involved in a scholarship activity, the extent and type of recognition an activity brings to the individual (and therefore to the School and to the larger institution), and the extent to which scholarship activities contribute to one’s teaching responsibilities. Higher ranks incur a higher level of expectation.

   2.1 Scholarly Activity
   - Mentoring student (e.g., S3)
   - Research associated with the development of upper level and graduate courses

   2.2 Professional Development / Recognition
   - Participation in professional working groups (e.g., a standards committee)

   2.3 Solicitation of External Support
   - Submitting a grant proposal
   - Successful grant proposal
   - Privately funded activities

   2.4 Publication
   - Refereed or invited conference papers
   - Refereed or invited journal articles
   - Paid articles
   - Book chapters and invited book chapters
• Professional society reports (e.g., proposed standards)
• Local articles (e.g., Grand Valley Review, Science/Math Update)

2.5 Consultation
• Publishing textbooks
• Presenting a conference tutorial and/or commercial seminars and workshops
• On-site training
• Consultation on specific projects

3. Service
Student advising, School, College, and University service are all facts of academic life. These activities do very little for either teaching or scholarship, but they are necessary, and expected of all levels of rank (Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Professor). Activities include, but are not limited to, committee work, curriculum development, proposal writing and special assignments. The School evaluates service primarily in terms of the amount of time it represents. The School attaches no particular value to the difference between appointed and elected service activities. In general, we prefer to shift the burden of service activities to established faculty so that new faculty can focus on their teaching and scholarship; therefore the service expectations at the College/University committee level are lower for junior faculty. For all levels of rank the guidelines (shown below) give an acceptable level of activity within this area.

3.0 School Service
• Advising student club(s) within the School, (e.g. the Computer Science Club)
• Teaching in areas that is not your specialty, due to School needs
• Development of new courses and programs within the School
• Special School assignments (e.g., transfer credit assessment)
• Creation, supervision, and/or maintenance of a laboratory facility for the School

3.1 College / University Service
• College committee participation
• University committee participation
• Outreach activities
• Science Olympiad, STEPS, FIRST Robotics, etc.
• Development of new programs for the University (e.g., new program proposals)

3.2 Community Service
This includes, but is not limited to, membership, participation, and leadership in community organizations. The School particularly values Community Service where a faculty member’s expertise is applied.
• Outreach activities (e.g., computer related School visits)
• Science fair participation
• Pro bono (computing related) consultations to voluntary organizations.

3.3 Professional Service
• Committee work for professional organizations
• Conference participation (e.g., committee, planning, session chair, etc.)
• Appointed position in professional organizations
• Elected position in professional organizations
• Program Chair (3 credits/semester)
• Internship supervision
D. Evaluation Process

Two functions are guided by the School's personnel policies: salary evaluation, and performance evaluation for retention, tenure, and promotion. The School has adopted the above criteria to be used for both purposes. The School finds it impossible to guess everyone's sense of relative importance among teaching, scholarship, and service. Instead, each faculty member determines (and reports in their annual activity report) the mix (s)he feels best describes the activities of the past year. Faculty peers agree to evaluate with respect to the mix identified by the person being evaluated. Within the realities of the University, the School identifies the minima and maxima as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionnel Proportion</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVSU Pattern</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS Minima</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS Maxima</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As examples, if a person elects to maximize teaching, their profile would be 75% teaching, 10% scholarship, and 15% service. We would not expect much in the way of scholarly activities, but we would expect strong teaching evidence. At the other extreme, if a person maximizes scholarship, their profile would be 50% scholarship, and the remainder split between teaching and service. The School would expect significant scholarly activity, and would tolerate minimal Pro-active activities and service.

1. Examples
   - Maximize teaching: 75% teaching, 10% scholarship, and 15% service.
     With this emphasis, The School might expect significant evidence of activity in the Pro-active activities in section 1.1 of this document. In addition, The School also expects above average student teaching evaluations. Since this profile means that the person has chosen to focus on teaching, The School would only expect minimal scholarship and service activities (e.g., minimal School committee work).
   - Maximize scholarship: 40% teaching, 50% scholarship, and 10% service.
     With this mix, The School might expect consistent patterns at the higher ends of two or more categories. Suggestions for satisfying a 50% scholarship is to perhaps to write grant proposals, publish refereed papers, and/or do some consulting. At the 50% scholarship level, released time is the norm. The School would expect reasonable student teaching evaluations, and a few of the Pro-active activities list above. The most desirable would be the incorporation of scholarship results into teaching duties.
   - Maximize service: 55% teaching, 10% scholarship, and 35% service.
     The service-oriented individual may take on a severe committee load; if so, The School expects less in the areas of teaching and scholarship. With this mix, The School would expect only minimal scholarship activities, and a fair amount of Pro-active activity.

2. Minimum levels

2.1 Teaching
   - Normal class load
   - Reasonable student evaluations
   - Acceptable office hours
   - Some pro-active activities

2.2 Scholarship
   - Regular readings of journals
   - Participation in discussion groups (e.g., the Visual Basic study group)
   - Use of a new tool or product (e.g., a CASE tool or a multimedia product)
   - Membership in professional organizations
   - Attendance at conferences, meetings
   - Some other activities in Section A, sub-section 2.1- 2.5

2.3 Service
   - Student Advising
   - School committee participation
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III. Individualized Strategic Plan

Each faculty member must develop and maintain an individual strategic plan stating goals for teaching, scholarship, and service. This plan must be consistent with the strategic plan of the School of Computing and Information Systems. Each faculty member’s strategic plan must be submitted at the same time as the Annual Individualized Workload Plan. This plan is subject to review and approval by the Director of the School Computing and Information Systems.

IV. Annual Individualized Workload Plan

Each faculty member must develop an annual workload plan consistent with that faculty member’s strategic plan. A draft workload plan must be submitted, using the required form, to the Director of the School of Computing and Information Systems by September 15 of each year.

In completing and submitting the Annual Individualized Workload plan each faculty member should consider the following:

- **Teaching:** At minimum, a person needs to indicate the number of credit hours he or she will be teaching per semester. Listing specific courses may be impractical because of expected changes between when the time schedules are built and the semester begins. The specific courses taught will be listed on the Annual Activity Report (AAR) when it is time for the annual evaluation.

- **Scholarship:** The more detailed a faculty member can be in planning scholarship activities, the better the Director will able to support the effort with related resources, collaboration, or other professional opportunities. However, the faculty member only needs to plan what scholarly project(s) he or she will pursue and for what outcome or audience. For example, faculty should give at least the general topic of a publication, presentation, or activity they will be working on. However it is not necessary to provide exact detail on the approach to the topic, focus within the topic, or the specific publication, exhibit, performance venue, project, or conference to which it will be submitted or applied. The details of work accomplished will be included in the AAR at annual review time.

- **Service:** The same general rule applies to planning service activities. Faculty will need to plan the type of activities they are interested in performing, or for which he/she is running or applying. The details about service work actually accomplished will be noted on the AAR submission for the annual review, as is current practice.

The Director will notify all School of Computing and Information Systems faculty members when the draft workload plans are submitted. Faculty will be given the opportunity to evaluate their colleagues individualized workload plan and strategic plan unless a two-thirds majority of the faculty vote to waive that option. Following academic year schedule development a faculty member will be presented their teaching schedules for the next calendar year (winter, spring/summer, and fall semesters) in order to provide guidance to the faculty in submitting a final workload plan. A faculty member’s calendar year schedule will be presented prior to the Thanksgiving holiday break, unless prior notification is given by the Director. The final workload plan must be submitted, using the required form, to the Director no later than the last day of classes for fall semester.

The draft and final workload plan is subject to review and approval by the Director of the School of Computing and Information Systems. Faculty who disagree with the final workload plan approval may appeal using pertinent supporting material according to the procedure specified in Chapter 3, Section 3.01.P.3 Complaint Procedure of the GVSU Faculty Handbook.

Any changes to a faculty member’s final approved individualized workload and rewards plan must be communicated in writing within 30 days of a change, including supporting documentation. This includes both faculty and administrative changes.

V. Annual Individualized Workload Plan Timeline

- **September 15** – Faculty submit draft Annual Individualized Workload Plan and updated Individual Strategic Plan
- **October 1** – Faculty evaluation of draft Annual Individualized Workload Plan due
- **Prior to the Thanksgiving Break** – Faculty receive calendar year schedules from Director
- **Last day of fall semester classes** – Final faculty Annual Individualized Workload Plans and Strategic Plans due

VI. Annual Performance Review and Salary Adjustment

During the annual salary and performance review meeting each individual faculty member and Director will also discuss the faculty member’s individualized workload plan for the coming calendar year, in addition to the peer salary recommendation. The Director will provide written evaluation of the faculty member using the Annual Performance Evaluation document.
School of Computing & Information Systems
20XX Workload Plan

In collaboration with your Unit Head establish an annual workload plan that contains teaching, scholarship, creative activities and service expectations. Identify activities for the 2010 calendar year that best represent your interests and strengths while contributing to the unit, college, and university teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service goals.

Name: ____________________________________  Date: __________________

Workload Plan for the 20XX Calendar Year

BASELINE ACTIVITIES

Teaching:
Winter 20XX Courses:
- CS nnn
- CS nnn
- CS nnn

Spring/Summer 20XX Courses:
- CS nnn

Fall 20XX Courses:
- CS nnn
- CS nnn

Scholarship and Creative Activities Plan (SCAP):
- List and describe your plans for scholarly activities. Use the concept that Scholarship must include dissemination

Service: (For each activity designate the level of service as (u) for unit, (c) for college, (uw) for university, (p) for professional, or (c) for community.)
- School / College / University Committee

Professional Development Plans:
- describe your plans for growing professionally.

SIGNIFICANT AREA OF FOCUS
- In this section, explain what you will be working on, and producing, (disseminating), or involved in that would merit a one-course reduction in teaching assignments. Include any administrative assignments here.

Unit Head Comments:

___________________________________________________  _______________________
Unit Head Signature  Date

___________________________________________________  _______________________
Faculty Member Signature  Date

____________________________________  _______________________
Dean Signature  Date