

College of Education Faculty Workload Policy

The typical practice in the College of Education when assigning faculty workload for Tenured and Tenure Eligible (T/TE) faculty is to assign a distribution of effort of 40% Research/Scholarship, 40% Teaching, and 20% Service/Outreach. The typical practice for Career Track (CT) faculty is to assign an initial workload distribution of effort of 80% Teaching and 20% Service/Outreach for both Lecturers and Professors of Practice.

Exceptions to the typical workload are commonly made under two conditions: 1) when a faculty member is allotted one or more “course release(s)” or 2) when a faculty member obtains internal university or extramural grant funding and request one or more “course buy-out(s)” supported by that funding.¹ Course releases are commonly offered to newly-hired tenured or tenure-eligible (T/TE) faculty members at the point of hire or are allotted to a CT or T/TE faculty member who takes on a leadership role in service to their department or college (e.g., Associate Head, Program Director, Program Chair, Director of Graduate Studies, etc.). In such cases, a faculty member's workload percentage in Teaching should be reduced and shifted to reflect additional FTE for the relevant category of work (e.g., Research/Scholarship or Service/Outreach). These guidelines are based on the University of Arizona’s descriptions of workload categories, found here:

<https://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/faculty-workload-distribution>. Unlike Service/Outreach, a workload assignment involving Administrative Service is reserved for administrative positions within the institution, typically the level of Department Head or Assistant/Associate Dean or equivalent position.

Decisions regarding approval of course buy-outs and course releases will be made at the discretion of the Department Head in consultation with the individual faculty member while considering the department needs and resources. Department Heads are encouraged to offer two course releases to T/TE faculty upon hire and provide some stipulations for any other course releases offered, such as evidence of seeking or securing external funding opportunities, new curriculum development, etc.

Faculty should generally consider activities related to graduate student mentoring and advising in the category of Teaching, understanding that there may be valid reasons to *also* report such work as Scholarship (e.g. co-authoring publications with students or co-presenting at conferences) or Service/Outreach (e.g. providing organized workshops and other professional development opportunities to students on behalf of your entire department or college).

The Department Head has the discretion to determine what constitutes a 10% course release for leadership in service to the department or college.² The Department has the discretion to determine what constitutes an overload of advising responsibilities equivalent to a 10% teaching load and worthy of a course release annually or every two or three years. Department Heads are encouraged to provide faculty with metrics for advising load expectations by status and rank.

Concerns around equity among faculty in their teaching and service responsibilities across departments should be identified and addressed by the Office of the Dean.

¹ These are the most common but not the only reasons for arranging course releases or course buyouts.

² The 2022-23 Dean’s Task Force on Career Track Faculty Policy suggested that leadership duties related to program coordination, which average at least four hours per week (about 65 hours per semester or 130 hours over the academic year), should be considered equivalent to .10 FTE. Eight hours per week would be considered .20 FTE.

Workload Assignment Process

Faculty loads (both T/TE and CT) are determined at the time of hire, with approval of the Department Head and Dean and reviewed each year in consultation with the Department Head as part of the faculty Annual Performance Review process.

The Department Head should be in agreement with the Dean regarding the faculty workload assigned and documented at the point of hire as an addendum to a faculty member's offer letter that specifies workload percentages. Such percentages are then either continued or adjusted annually during the faculty Annual Performance Review process. For new faculty hires, workload will be decided in consultation with the Department Head and discussed with the new faculty member prior to or during the initial week of employment. After an initial workload assignment is determined and entered into the MSS Faculty Workload dashboard in UACCESS Analytics, workload is then re-assigned annually by the Department Head following the annual review process conducted in accordance with [UHAP Policy 3.2](#) (Annual Performance Reviews of Faculty). For any given academic year, faculty workload should be discussed, finalized, and entered into the MSS Faculty Workload dashboard in UACCESS Analytics retroactively before the end of June for the corresponding fiscal year. Based on a review and discussion and/or written communication regarding their workload that should occur between the Department Head and faculty member during the Annual Review process, the workload percentage for the upcoming year will be proactively determined and then documented and communicated in writing to each currently employed faculty member. If any adjustments need to be made from year to year, they should be discussed during or prior to the Annual Review. If the Department Head and faculty member cannot come to an agreement, the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs should be consulted.

A faculty member's workload can either remain consistent or shift from year to year. Should there be a change in faculty circumstances (e.g., faculty receives external funding, is approved for a sabbatical or professional development leave, or some other change of position or responsibilities, etc.) or if the needs across the College or Department change (e.g., new course approved, teaching or department service needs change, etc.), workload can be reassigned for any given year after discussion with the faculty member and the Department Head. Upon such a change, workload percentages will be entered into the MSS Faculty Workload dashboard in UACCESS Analytics.

Each department should have a staff person assigned to function as the "departmental coordinator" for Annual Performance Reviews, and that person will be responsible for entering faculty workload into the MSS dashboard.

Teaching Workload Guidance

In determining teaching responsibilities for a 10% workload assignment, the following guidance should be considered.

Enrollment Minimums³

College-level course size enrollment **minimums** and/or student credit hours (SCH) **minimums**:

- 500 or 600 level: 10 students / 30-40 SCH
- 400 level or below: 20 students / 60 SCH

Enrollment Targets

It is advisable to reach the following enrollment/SCH *target* levels:

- 500 or 600 level: at least 20 students / 60-80 SCH
- 400 level or below: at least 35 students / 105 SCH

When determining enrollment minimums and targets, it is important for a Department Head to consider a faculty member's course enrollments for an entire semester and academic year, not just individual classes. The rationale for this is that classes well above target enrollments can compensate for lower-enrolled classes, resulting in an *average* class enrollment across the semester or across the academic year that meets the target level or exceeds the minimum enrollment level. The same rationale applies for class enrollments and SCH generation across the department.

When a class exceeds enrollment targets, the Department Head has the discretion to determine the maximum level of enrollment and the point at which enrollments warrant the addition of a teaching assistant (TA) or the opening up of another course section with a new instructor. Department Heads should share such decisions with the College Leadership Council in an effort to remain informed about the degree of consistency/standardization of such practices across the college.

These targets are more ideal for lecture-based classes or discussion seminars, but best practice for alternative or less traditional formats require smaller class sizes.

Best practices suggest lower enrollment targets for the following common circumstances:⁴

Circumstance #1: The Indigenous Teacher Education Program (ITEP) serves small cohorts of Indigenous pre-service teachers completing an Elementary Education degree in an effort to address the Indigenous teacher shortage in Arizona. ITEP prepares future Indigenous educators trained to address unique Tribal needs through curriculum and teaching methods and Indigenize teacher education by centering Indigenous communities, Indigenous concerns, needs, languages, and knowledge systems.⁵

Circumstance #2: Accreditation requirements for some licensed professional programs necessitate the maintenance of particular faculty-student ratios, resulting in lower class enrollment targets (e.g., Council of Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, National Association of School Psychologists).⁶

³ Individual faculty members should not be unilaterally penalized if enrollment minimums are not met, as a complex mix of factors are at play. It is the joint responsibility of the faculty member and department leadership to address the challenge and to problem-solve solutions to avoid consistently low-enrollments.

⁴ This list does not preclude the Department Head from determining other reasonable exceptions to meeting enrollment targets. The Department Head may exercise discretion to make decisions that benefit the unit as a whole.

⁵ TLS 327 and 409

⁶ MA and PhD programs in Counseling; Ed.S. and Ph.D. programs in School Psychology

Circumstance #3: Some classes in degree programs involving teacher, principal, superintendent, school psychologists, and counselor certification/licensure requirements (e.g., Arizona Department of Education) that involve cohort-based internship or lab experiences, field placements, practicums, and clinical supervision often necessitate lower enrollment targets. Key examples include Educational Leadership, Early Childhood Education, and Elementary Education, particularly the bilingual endorsement to teach in English and Spanish, which needs to group together students who have similar levels of language fluency for instructional purposes.⁷

Circumstance #4: The work of School Site Coordinators, Field Placement Coordinators, and Field Experience/Internship Coordinators is not accurately captured by current enrollment and student credit hour (SCH) metrics.

- School Site Coordinators make all arrangements for students majoring in professional preparation degree programs (i.e. Educational Leadership; Elementary and Early Childhood Education) to participate in off-campus, on-site, field-embedded courses in local schools with current practicing teachers. The level of complexity involved is intense and not comparable to routine on-campus or on-line course. Site Coordinators perform an essential component of teacher professional preparation instruction, building and maintaining strong partnerships with schools locally and across the state so undergraduates who are prospective teachers can be matched with high quality mentor teachers and placed in receptive and ready school sites. Site coordinators spend time traveling to and being present in schools for important relationship-building, planning, preparation of space, and addressing challenges that arise at the school sites.⁸
- Internship or Field Experience Coordinators in the programs such as Educational Leadership, Counseling, Special Education and School Psychology cultivate relationships with personnel in school sites, hospitals, and community agencies and screen, plan, arrange, and implement field experiences for students in those degree programs to gain on-site experiences under supervision by appropriately credentialed professionals in their field (e.g., licensed psychologists, certified counselors). Programmatic needs demand that students have such internship and field experiences, and the coordination involves year-long responsibilities that extend well beyond teaching a typical class (e.g., workshop/training for site supervisors, outreach to identify new supervisors, matching students' skillsets with supervisor expertise, problem solving when there is a concern, and UA/field placement site agreements, which involve interfacing with university legal services, problem solving when there is a concern, etc.). Responsibilities guiding students through a practice-based Ed.D. (doctorate) in Educational Leadership apply here as well.⁹

⁷ SERP 593, 594, 694b, 693b, 694; TLS 301, 303, 308, 309, 312, 314, 316, 319, 322, 323, 324, 326, 336, 321, 357, 401, 403, 411, 416, 527, 533, 534, 535, 536, 539, 540, 546, 593a, 593b

⁸ TLS 322, 323, 324, 326, 336, 394, 401, 493, 498, 384, 484

⁹ SERP 593, 594, 693b, 694b; EDL 563, 593a,b,c; EDL 567, 568, 604; EDL 676, EDL 677, 678