

Senate Administration Workgroup on Faculty Workload

Final Report

Table of Content

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Workgroup charge**
 - 2.1 Original charge to the Workgroup**
 - 2.2 Modification of the Workgroup charge**
- 3. Survey questions**
- 4. Summary of survey from Divisions**
 - 4.1 Division of Arts and Humanities**
 - 4.2 Division of Biological Sciences**
 - 4.3 Division of Engineering**
 - 4.4 Division of Physical Sciences**
 - 4.5 Division of Social Sciences**
 - 4.6 School of Global Policy and Strategy**
 - 4.7 School of Medicine**
 - 4.8 Rady School of Management**
 - 4.9 Scripps Institution of Oceanography**
- 5. Summary and Recommendations**

Appendix 1: Charge Letter to the Workgroup

Appendix 2: Department survey inputs

Appendix 3: Departments' faculty rank and merit advancement documents

Appendix 4: Glossary Acronyms and Terms

1. Introduction

Faculty are periodically reviewed for merit and promotion advancement based on their scholarly activity (research and/or creative activity), teaching, both University and professional service, and contributions to diversity. There is considerable variation across campus regarding departmental standards in each of these areas. The Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) expects that each department will have documented standards for each series criteria that can be used for file evaluation.

Departmental teaching standards evolve over time. Currently, the Dean of Undergraduate Education keeps a record of these standards for the General Campus and Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) and must approve any changes, following consultation with divisional Deans and the Executive Vice Chancellor.

In some cases, departments have developed internal workload standards that provide broader holistic metrics of faculty engagement. In these cases, there are points assigned to departmental teaching (undergraduate and graduate), service, and graduate student mentoring activities. In addition, teaching is not just quantified by number of courses, but by enrollment as well.

The Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Workload (referred to as the Workgroup) was assembled in 2018 to gather the workload standards in disciplines across campus. The Workgroup first met on January 30, 2019 and there have been 7 Workgroup meetings throughout the winter and spring quarters of 2019. The Workgroup also consulted the Academic Senate Chair and Vice-Chair, the Committee on Academic Personnel, and the Council of Department Chairs for their inputs on the Department Survey questions. The last Workgroup meeting was held on May 22, 2019.

In accordance to the Charge Letter (Appendix 1), the Workgroup was comprised of 15 members from various Divisions/Schools at UC San Diego:

1. Paul Yu, Interim Dean, Graduate Division (co-Chair)
2. Tara Hutchinson, Structural Engineering (co-Chair)
3. Catherine Constable, Chair and Deputy Director, IGGP/SIO
4. Robert Continetti, Senior AVC, Academic Affairs
5. Amanda Datnow, Associate Dean, Social Sciences
6. Judith Dolan, Professor, Theatre and Dance
7. Peter Ebenfelt, Associate Dean, Physical Sciences
8. David Gutierrez, Senior Associate Dean, Arts and Humanities
9. Juan Lasheras, Professor, MAE
10. Craig McKenzie, Professor, Rady School of Management
11. John Moore, Dean, Undergraduate Education
12. Piyush Patel, Professor, Anesthesiology

13. Pamela Ratcliff, Chair, History
14. Andrew Scull, Professor Sociology
15. Elina Zuniga, Professor, Molecular Biology

2. Workgroup charge

2.1 Original charge to the Workgroup

The Workgroup was originally charged (see Appendix 1) with the following tasks:

- Solicit and document departmental workload and scholarly activity standards (and the underlying departmental rationales for these standards) for all General Campus, SIO, and Health Sciences departments.
- Develop a glossary defining commonly used terms: workload, teaching load, etc. (e.g. see Unit 18 contract for an example of definition of terms).
- Consult with department chairs and CAP regarding workload standards in the overall context of the University's mission and their use for setting expected norms of faculty engagement in scholarly activity, teaching, and service as well as in file review. Regarding instruction, comment on the principles under which teaching relief is granted and how the development, offering, and maintenance of online courses might be taken into consideration in the future.
- Recommend a process through which departments can propose to modify their workload standards, apply for necessary approvals (e.g. for changing teaching standards), and inform the appropriate University offices of the new standards. Clarify the documentation to be included in this process.

2.2 Modification of the Workgroup charge

After the initial meeting, the Workgroup decided that the departmental scholarly activities standards for faculty would be too controversial and that some departments may be reluctant to provide information for the Workgroup. Also, the Workgroup focus should be on teaching workload and service related to teaching and mentoring as they applied to all senate faculty. In consultation with Academic Senate Chair and Vice-Chair, the Workgroup revised the charge (a) to reflect the workload standard to emphasize the teaching workload, (b) to understand how the department views the mentoring and other informal teaching activities w.r.t the standards. Therefore the modified first bullet in 2.1 becomes:

- Solicit and document departmental workload standards (and the underlying departmental rationales for these standards) for all General Campus, SIO, and Health Sciences departments

3. Survey Questions

The Workgroup deliberated about the survey questions for assessing issues related to faculty teaching and service. Specifically, departments were asked to respond to the following:

1. Does the department have formal teaching workload standards for both ladder rank research and teaching professors? If so, do the standards include guidelines or regulations regarding the combination of undergraduate and graduate courses, class size or any other considerations beyond number of courses taught? Are student mentoring and other informal teaching activities incorporated in the standards? The Workgroup would appreciate obtaining a copy of the latest version of these standards. Please comment on how these are disseminated to the Department/ School/Division.
2. Please comment on the criteria for teaching relief in your department. Who initiates the request? What are the typical reasons adduced for such requests? And what is the usual magnitude of teaching relief, when granted? Is course release provided for any departmental service positions, such as graduate and undergraduate chairs?
3. What are the department's expectations of faculty's non-compensated professional and campus service? Do these vary by rank?
4. Are online courses offered by your department? Please comment on how/if they are considered in faculty teaching workload.
5. How does the department view its faculty teaching in programs elsewhere on campus? Are outside of department courses taught by faculty counted within faculty workload? What are the perceived benefits and disadvantages for the department?
6. Can you describe any challenges to achieving an equitable workload across the department? If so, have you put in place any mechanisms to implement potential remedies?
7. Does the department have a process for modifying its workload standards? If so please summarize/outline what steps are taken, including how the changes are monitored.

4. Summary of Survey from Divisions

4.1 Division of Arts of Humanities

The Division of Arts and Humanities is comprised of six departments. Three are Arts departments (Music, Theatre & Dance, Visual Arts); three are Humanities departments (History, Literature, Philosophy). All departments offer one or two terminal graduate degrees, including Ph.D., MFA, and D.M.A.

The variety of disciplines as well as that of graduate programs results in complex workload structures. Some areas of study can accommodate large lecture classes, while others, particularly in the arts, may require smaller groups and/or individual instruction. The chairs' responses indicate that workload equity is an ongoing topic for discussion and that decisions about teaching assignments, course relief and service expectations are factored into faculty's annual and/or biennial overall workloads.

Similarities:

1. Service expectations: In general, a sliding scale exists in all departments with little or no service expectations for nontenured faculty and greater expectations for senior faculty.
2. Shared governance: whatever the decision-making process or structure for course load oversight, most chairs indicate that standards/guidelines for workloads continue to be an ongoing and evolving issue within the department.
3. LSOE: Six courses are the uniform course load across departments that support the teaching professor category.
4. Online courses: No departments currently offer online courses although at least one is being developed in the Music Department.

Differences:

1. Course release criteria varies significantly: Chairs may receive all or some course release; some release is individually negotiated by faculty for significant service commitments (such as associate/vice chair, graduate studies head, CAP, etc.) at both departmental and university levels; some course release is tabulated by a point system.
2. Number of courses for ladder ranked faculty: the range is between 4 and 5, some of which may be calculated over a two-year period.
3. Issues of class size: many departments consider workload distribution in light of class size, while others deem close supervision and mentoring as a part of the workload calculation, particularly in the arts where classes may, by necessity, be small. Time spent on instruction is a factor in the distribution of workload.
4. College courses: there is a wide differential in departments in terms of teaching within the college system and expressed concern as to how these courses may "count" for the

departments. Some faculty teach these courses as “overload” depending on the parameters of their initial appointment.

Summary of Responses to Survey Questions

1. All departments within the Arts and Humanities have workload expectations for both ladder rank and teaching professors that are articulated as formal standards or guidelines. All faculty are expected to teach both in the undergraduate and graduate programs, although depending on the internal structure of the department, there is variance in that distribution. Mentoring, close supervision and individual instruction is more prevalent in some forms of artistic practice (studio and performance, in particular) but all humanities programs (including doctoral programs within the arts departments) also require time-consuming mentoring, which is sometimes not recognized within current workload structures.

2. There is a wide variance in how departments determine teaching relief/release:

Course load: The Humanities departments, History, Literature and Philosophy, utilize a point system to track overload teaching or large class size, but the point systems are not uniform. The point system is also useful in determining mentorship in such demands as time-intensive thesis supervision. The Arts departments, Music, Visual Arts and Theatre and Dance, do not use point systems: equity is achieved through individual assessments of time spent in mentoring, supervision and individual instruction/advising, dependent on the demands of each discipline.

Departmental administration: All departmental chairs are given course release that varies from no teaching at all (Visual Arts) to 3-4 course release (Literature) to 2 course release (all others). There is a wide variance in granting course release for other internal administrative duties, some of which are clearly established. Five departments grant course release for administrative duties such as head of graduate or undergraduate studies or vice chairs, etc. that range from .5 to 1 annual course reduction. Theatre and Dance grants no course release for departmental service. The Division grants 1 course release to program heads: Science Studies, Chinese Studies, etc.

University Administration: History and Literature acknowledge CAP and Senate leadership service with 1 course release.

3. The expectations of service vary by faculty rank. Service expectations are initially modest for faculty at the Assistant Professor or LPSOE ranks and they increase as faculty advance in the promotion process. Assistant professors and LPSOE’s may serve on

discrete departmental level committees; associate professors and LSOE's are expected to continue to add university service to their profile that reflect their ranks; full professors should demonstrate service to the department, the community, the profession and to the university. Professors at VI or Above Scale are expected to demonstrate leadership roles with significant university service as well as professional service outside of the campus.

4. There are no online courses taught in any of the departments, although one is currently in development in Music.
5. History, Literature and Philosophy all encourage faculty to teach in MMW, CAT, HUM, DOC, etc. and this activity counts within faculty workload. Music engages occasionally, and those courses are included in the teaching load calculations. Two or three Theatre and Dance faculty teach in the colleges but are calculated as overload. The advantages include achieving visibility for the departments and adding large enrollments for departments. The disadvantage is that TA FTE does not go to the departments. Visual Arts has previously encouraged faculty to teach in the programs but notes that the departments are no longer compensated for this service and do not receive course credit for courses taught outside of the department. They are now reconsidering the issue as it requires that they hire outside lecturers to cover their own needs. In general, the departments do not feel well-compensated for this work.
6. History and Philosophy do not report challenges to establishing equitable workloads; all faculty have the same formal teaching load, so the only imbalance is in number of PhD student mentoring, which the point system takes into consideration.

Literature, Theatre and Dance, and Visual Arts identified varied enrollments within the department sections and disciplines as a challenge in determining equitable workloads. The arts departments, in particular, noted the necessity to offer smaller classes at both undergraduate and graduate levels which makes achieving equity (based on enrollment numbers) a challenge. One proposed remedy is to balance teaching with departmental service. Another proposal currently be considered is to rotate large classes among faculty to achieve internal balance.

7. In general, departments establish standards through ongoing consultation between departmental leadership and faculty at faculty meetings. Decisions or changes to standards and guidelines are then put to faculty vote.

4.2 Division of Biological Sciences

The Division of Biological Sciences is split into four sections, but has standard metrics for assigning teaching across all four units, and the dean and a divisional committee are involved in the rule-making process, and in making decisions about possible exceptions to the standard policy.

1. The policy on teaching load guidelines was originally established in Fall Quarter 2008, and has been revised on six occasions since then, most recently in February 2017. The section places a heavy emphasis on laboratory instruction and mentoring, separately from the formal courses it offers, and this is reflected in its formal course standards, which are reduced to account for this additional instruction and mentoring.

Units are assigned to undergraduate and graduate courses in accordance with the unit values enrolled students receive. During the first year of an appointment, a new faculty member (regardless of rank) is excused from all formal course teaching, presumably to facilitate the establishment of a laboratory and research program. The second year brings a requirement to teach at least one four-unit course at the graduate or undergraduate level, and in subsequent years, faculty are expected to teach either six units of formal courses each year, or four units in year one and eight units in year two.

There is a divisional education committee which oversees these standards and is responsible for ensuring they are followed. Some provision is made to allow a faculty member who is teaching a large course (defined as 400+ students) to request assignment to a smaller second undergraduate class. The committee is constructed to have faculty representation from each section, with two members drawn from amongst the teaching professors, plus the Director of Undergraduate Education for the Division as a whole. It appears to play an important role in monitoring teaching assignments, ensuring equity, and hearing requests for special treatment of an individual faculty member, and its breadth of membership thus seems crucial to its successful functioning, and a useful check on what the arrangements are in individual sections. While not, perhaps, so readily applied in other divisions, it is perhaps worth considering whether comparable procedure might be useful in other portions of the campus. Certainly, there are very explicit guidelines and checks and balances here which are helpful in both ensuring coverage of curricula, and in maintaining a sense of equity within and among the sections that make up the Division.

Teaching professors are expected to teach two formal courses per quarter, reduced to 5 courses per year if they take a leadership service role in divisional education. Those

ladder rank faculty who do not have extramural funding for two years or more may be asked to take on additional formal teaching assignments, given their reduced role in the mentoring and informal teaching of students in their labs. For all faculty, mentoring is considered a critical component of teaching load, although the number of students mentored by different Faculty does not seem to be contemplated. Overall, each member of the faculty teaches 1.5 formal (4 unit) undergraduate and/or graduate courses per year. The combination of formal courses and other instructional duties MUST reflect at least 3.0 courses per year on the Course Load and Student Direction form.

2. The Education Committee assigns courses in consultation with the individual faculty member and in consultation with the relevant section.

Any faculty member seeking modified teaching duties has to submit a fully justified request via their section chair. The dean and all four section chairs consider and rule on all such requests, with the dean having the tie-breaking vote where general agreement is not secured. Individual chairs do not have the power to reduce teaching loads, and the documentation for any such reduction is included in the faculty member's review file. Beyond sabbaticals and family accommodations, the major listed reason for teaching relief is extensive service "well beyond what is expected for a faculty member of a given rank." There are no reductions because of offers received from elsewhere: the expectation is an equitable distribution of teaching requirements which all faculty are expected to adhere to.

This latter procedure can have potential relevance elsewhere on campus. It ensures consistent standards are applied across the entire Division, and precludes sweetheart deals and course reductions that are not adequately justified. Since the relevant documentation supporting the original faculty request is submitted with the academic file forwarded to CAP, it also makes sure that academic reviews can take adequate account of these special arrangements.

3. For those with administrative or extensive campus or system-wide service responsibilities, there are appropriate levels of relief from teaching. These only apply to a short list of major tasks, and are modulated according to the responsibilities these entail. This is a practice that could serve as a general model for other departments and units, avoiding the unfairness of radically different standards that departments which are outliers in their division may engage in.

Service expectations vary by rank, ratcheting up as faculty are promoted to higher levels of the professorship, and making efforts to protect junior faculty.

4. No online courses are offered in the Division.
5. Courses taught outside the section do not count towards a faculty member's teaching obligations for the year, but rather are counted as service to the university. This policy is justified by referring to the heavy internal requirements for teaching, given very large student enrollment in biology courses, and a general shortage of faculty.
6. Issues of equity are the responsibility of the divisional education committee, and are addressed, if necessary, by discussions with the relevant section chair, and the faculty member. The process ensures cross-sectional attention to this issue.
7. Because of a number of zero-percent joint appointments, and especially links to Salk Institute which are governed by a formal MOU, the divisional response contains considerable added details on how these situations are managed. In Appendix 3, the Division spells out in some detail its procedures for evaluation of existing faculty, both ladder rank and teaching professors, and for initial appointments.

Overall, the Division responded helpfully and in detail to the Survey, and supplied a thorough accounting of how it operates.

4.3 Division of Engineering

JSOE has six departments: Bioengineering (BE), Computer Science and Engineering (CSE), Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE), Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (MAE), Nanoengineering (NE), and Structural Engineering (SE). All departments responded to the survey. In Fall 2018, JSOE had 8,976 students enrolled and 249 faculty. It is a rapidly growing school with 90 faculty hired in the last 5 years. The smallest department is SE, with 662 total students and 23 faculty. The largest department is CSE with 2692 total students and 61 faculty. The largest student/faculty ratio is also within the CSE department at 44.1, and the smallest is within the NE department at 27.8, see Table 4.3.1.

Table 4.3.1. JSOE demographics as of Fall 2018

Department	Faculty	Undergraduates	Graduates	Total	Total student/faculty ratio
BE	29	593	307	900	31.0
CSE	61	1855	837	2692	44.1
ECE	57	1255	914	2169	38.1
MAE	49	1186	533	1719	35.1
NE	30	663	171	834	27.8
SE	23	473	189	662	28.7

Summary of Individual Department Response to Workload Survey

In what follows, the response to the 7 questions begins with a brief summary reporting where consistencies are observed across JSOE departments for that particular question; subsequently important aspects where individual responses varied are reported.

Similarities within JSOE departments for all questions include the following:

- 1) All departments (with the exception of CSE) note that 3-4 courses/year are common
- 2) Additional consideration for larger courses could be considered (in some department it is formalized based on enrollment).
- 3) Most departments mention lesser teaching requirements of junior faculty (either smaller courses or less formal courses)
- 4) Faculty in each department may have teaching relief due to excessive research or service demands, though the commonality or formalization of this for faculty varied due to the teaching demands on some departments. Most departments note that faculty may initiate this request.
- 5) With the exception of one course in one department (NE); no JSOE departments offer credit to its faculty for online courses (CSE and NE are the only departments offering online courses presently).

1. Most departments reported they do have standards, and most were formalized, written with faculty input. Departments without official written standards included NE and SE. In these cases, the departments either relied on JSOE standards (NE) or have an informal policy and are developing their formal standards currently (SE). With the exception of CSE, each department shared any formal annual teaching workload they have and its most important aspects with the committee. Below are highlights of individual department responses.

BE: Yes. LRF expected to teach 3 courses annually. LPSOE expected to teach six courses annually. Course load does not include 199, 299 and design supervision courses. Each faculty expected to teach one UG courses/year.

CSE: Yes, however policy not shared with committee. Mentioned equal balance of UG and G courses. Each LRF is expected to teach at least one large (>100 class) per year. Extra credit is given for very large classes. No credit is given for mentoring or advising.

ECE: Yes, cited campus policy in engineering of teaching 4.0 courses. However, teaching workload varied based on rank (see Table 4.3.2 provided by ECE). ECE also estimates teaching workload according to the size of the course, see Table 4.3.3 for undergraduate and graduate courses.

Table 4.3.2. ECE Teaching Workload Requirements

Rank/Step	Teaching Workload (# courses per year)
Assistant Professor, Step I through III	3.0
Assistant Professor, Step IV and Above	3.5
Associate Professor, All Steps	4.0
Full Professor, All Steps	4.0
Associate/ Full Professor, not active in research	5.5-6.0
Sr. Lecturer/Lecturer Security of Employment	6.0
Temporary Lecturers	9.0

Table 4.3.3. ECE teaching workload credit (similar for undergraduate and graduate courses).

# of Students	Workload Credit
1 – 149	1.0

150 – 199	1.5
200 – 299	2.0
300 and above	2.5

MAE: Yes and no, to having formal workload standards. Teaching at discretion of chair, normal teaching load is three 4-credit courses/year, plus other teaching obligations (independent study, special topics, seminars, etc). One of the 3 courses must be a service course. Other courses may be a blend of UG and G courses.

NE: No official standards, cited JSOE policy, which was not provided to the committee. General teaching load 3 courses/year, either 2 UG/1G or 1UG/2G. Junior faculty usually assigned smaller (<49 students) enrollment courses.

SE: No official standards, however, have unofficial guidelines (typical teaching loads), and cited ECE as a resource for developing standards. LRF are required to teach a minimum of three courses/year (1UG/2G depending on needs); teaching faculty are required to teach 6 courses/year. Additional effort required for large classes is not considered, as additional TA/reader support is allocated.

2. In general, faculty in all departments across JSOE have an opportunity to request and receive teaching relief given either excessive service or research demands. Two departments (BE and ECE) had more formal written policies, where other departments had informal accepted relief options.

BE: Provided standard reductions policy. Instructors/faculty initiate requests for teaching relief. No more than two consecutive quarters of teaching relief is given due to Department teaching demands. Standard reductions include: Department Chair – 1-2 courses per year; Graduate Studies Committee Chair – 1 course per year; Undergraduate Studies Committee Chair – 1 course per year; Standing Graduate Student Qualifying Exam Committee – 1 course per year. One course reduction in first year for Assistant Prof may also be given.

CSE: No formal policy. One course relief for vice chair or directing a center. No teaching relief for university service, except CAP, where 1 course relief provided.

ECE: Detailed in formal policy. In general, faculty receive course relief for major departmental committee service (Grad Admissions, MS Comp Exam, Grad Affairs, and ECE CAP). The department Chair receives course relief which varies from 1 to 3 courses depending on the demands placed on the department and Chair in any given year. The Vice Chair receives a one course relief. In addition, faculty receive course relief for supporting graduate students.

MAE: No formal policy. However, no teaching relief currently provided due to large UG population; no relief for service. Chair has the authority to grant relief if needed.

NE: No formal policy. Faculty initiate request. Typical reasons include center director, ABET chair, Department Chair, sabbatical, etc. One quarter is typically given. No course relief is commonly given for graduate and undergraduate chairs.

SE: No formal policy. Cited teaching relief for department chair and vice chairs (1 course); sabbaticals, and as proposed by instructors.

3. An overarching comment of all JSOE departments to this question was that all faculty are expected to be involved with their professional communities and provide service to support the profession. Important professional service mentioned by JSOE departments included review and/or editorial service to journals and chairing or sub-chairing at conferences in their area. With the exception of CSE, faculty in all JSOE departments are expected to contribute to campus/University-wide service. CSE noted they communicate to its faculty that CAP expects university-level service. Most departments mention that they do not recommend high levels of service from junior faculty. Several departments mentioned that university-wide service is expected only of full professors (and not of junior faculty).
4. BE, ECE, MAE, and SE do not have online courses. CSE and NE do, and CSE does not give credit, while NE does as it fits within their normal curriculum. CSE notes they have many online outside courses; however, no teaching credit is given for them as instructors are compensated outside of the normal load (as “off-load” or within “outside professional activities”). This may change for CSE in the future. NE has one online course offered presently, and it is given a one course credit. MAE noted that when they offer online courses they will be considered as regular course credit.

5. All JSOE departments comment that it is not typical practice for faculty to teach outside of their department. Though a few (e.g. SE) commented that some courses are cross-listed with other engineering departments.

6. Individual JSOE departments shared varying current challenges, key aspects of individual responses are summarized below.

BE: A common challenge is how to enforce teaching/service assignments. Traditionally, this is done through the regular academic review of advancement or promotion. More recently, the Campus determines and with JSOE Dean's office review the annual GCCP eligibility based on a set of minimal good standing criteria, which is another effective mechanism to normalize workload across the department. Another challenge is disproportionate service loads for faculty, in part because under-represented and female faculty are asked to contribute more given their under-representation but yet desire to have balanced committee membership.

CSE: Current challenge is a few faculty that do not teach any large courses. Additional future challenges: 1) Online courses for credit – if they are taught onload, how much credit do they get? 2) Concept of mezzanine courses – a course that serves both as an advanced UG course, and a more basic MS class.

ECE: Equity related to course load managed by formalized workload policy. Noted that equity regarding enrollment size/course is harder to address.

MAE: Believes there is consensus that teaching loads in the department are now more balanced than they used to be because the rules are clearly stated and there is full transparency. Faculty with larger research groups often want or request teaching relief, but the fact is that those large groups and associated high productivities are counted positively in many other ways in the advancement and promotion files, so they are already heavily incentivized. If we reduce the teaching load for those with larger groups, the missing load has to be picked up by junior faculty and others with smaller research groups, which makes it impossible for them to be more productive or eventually grow their own research groups larger.

NE: Many NE courses have 110 - 150 students. To achieve requests of 49 and under in years 1 & 2 of campus implementation, new sections of courses were added after the schedule and registration had opened. Typically, the initial course students do not want

to switch, the new section may have very few and the original section could have 100 or more students. Also faculty do not understand why we can't do 75/75/ splits vs 49/100 +/- Faculty have said that this is not fair.

SE: The major challenge in SE this year was the need to hire external instructors to cover specialty courses that should be taught by faculty. Although most of these positions were due to sabbaticals and other expected issues, it may be due to the growth of our MS program in different areas. This is one reason SE would like to develop course relief standards.

7. BE, ECE, and NE note that any modifications to workload standards require faculty input. Most note that chair approval is needed. MAE does not have a process for modifying workload standards, though notes this is an ongoing challenge due to changing enrollments. CSE prepared internal standards at the time of the current chair appointment. CSE does not mention a formal process for revising standards. SE does not have formal workload standards, though mentions they would plan to incorporate a process for revisions when standards are available.

4.4 Division of Physical Sciences

Overview and Executive Summary.

The three departments Chemistry and Biochemistry, Physics, and Mathematics that comprise the Division of Physical Sciences are quite different in many respects. One of the main differences, which manifests itself in their teaching profiles, is that Chemistry/Biochemistry and Physics are a mixture of theoretical and experimental work whereas Mathematics is mainly a theoretical subject. Consequently, many courses in Chemistry/Biochemistry and Physics have significant lab components whereas in Mathematics this is not the case. Another difference is in the size of the undergraduate programs. Chemistry/Biochemistry and Mathematics are large (with Mathematics being extra-large, ~2,300 majors) while the Physics undergraduate program is significantly smaller (~400). A third difference is in the way Chemistry/Biochemistry is organized. The Chemistry/Biochemistry department has three sections, each with its own section chair and vice-chair. In this way, the Chemistry/Biochemistry department is similar to the Division of Biological Sciences.

The three departments all have different teaching loads (as historically set by campus leadership), but overall the similarities in policy and standards seem greater than the differences.¹

1. All three departments have well-defined teaching load standards. Chemistry/Biochemistry LRF normally teach 2 courses/year with the expectation being that one significant undergraduate course (large service course or one required for the major) is taught each year. The second course, which LRFs are expected to teach, can be a small undergraduate or a graduate class if the undergraduate course constitutes a significant workload (e.g., enrollment ≥ 200). Teaching equity is expected to be achieved over a course of 2-3 years. L(P)SOEs in Chemistry/Biochemistry teach 5 courses. Physics LRFs teach 3 courses/year and L(P)SOEs teach 6. Teaching time-consuming lab courses or being instructor of record for large combinations of lab courses may count as 1.5 courses. The expectation for LRFs in Physics is to teach one course per quarter. No information is given on how and in what way this can be modified. Mathematics LRFs teach 4 courses/year and L(P)SOEs teach 6. Large enrollments trigger extra fractional credits (e.g., enrollment ≥ 200 counts an extra 0.1, enrollment ≥ 400 and extra 0.25).

¹ The response from Math department was brief and did not address all parts of the questions in the questionnaire. The committee has added some information beyond that provided by the department, as noted by *.

*Mathematics uses a teaching load credit system where the exact balance of one's teaching (load minus courses taught, credits and reductions) is carried forward and added to your load the following year. The expectation is that faculty teach their load, rounded to the nearest integer, each year.

Beyond the expectation in Chemistry/Biochemistry described above, none of the departments have a formal division of the teaching load into undergraduate versus graduate courses. In all three departments, mentoring and advising of graduate students is expected for LRFs as part of the teaching obligation but is not counted toward the formal teaching load. Moreover, running a seminar does not count toward the teaching load.

All three departments have their teaching guidelines and policies posted on internally accessible web pages. In *Mathematics and Physics (no information is available for Chemistry/Biochemistry), faculty are provided a copy of their department's teaching policies and guidelines each year along with an opportunity to express teaching preference for the following year.

2. All three departments offer teaching relief for essentially three reasons:
 - (A) Service relief. The Chair has no teaching load in either *department. Vice-Chairs get 1-2 courses of relief. Other time-consuming committee work (e.g., CAP) also comes with a reduction. In *Mathematics, minor reductions also come standard for certain standing departmental committees.
 - (B) Assistant Professor relief. In Chemistry/Biochemistry, new assistant professors are relieved from one undergraduate and one graduate course before tenure. In Physics, assistant professors "usually" receive one course/year relief for two years. In *Mathematics, all new hires (including more senior hires) receive a one course/year reduction for two years.
 - (C) Other relief. All departments seem to entertain requests from faculty for teaching relief based on temporarily increased workload due to, e.g., professional service and commitments, course (re)development, etc. These requests are usually decided by the Chair, after consultation with a departmental leadership committee, on a case-by-case basis.

It appears that the vast majority of faculty in all three departments (at least in Physics and Mathematics) teach the expected load.

3. All three departments (including *Mathematics) have as a policy that Assistant Professor are assigned only a light service load, defined as one committee in Chemistry/Biochemistry and not quantified in the other two departments. Mathematics and Physics state that the expectations for departmental and campus-wide service increase with seniority. No such statement is made by Chemistry/Biochemistry, but this is clearly a general campus requirement and CAP will comment on this in the files that come their way.
4. None of the departments have online courses.
5. All three departments allow faculty to teach in programs outside the department. In Chemistry/Biochemistry and Physics, such teaching is considered to be off-load and does not count toward the normal teaching load; faculty are expected to be compensated in some other way. In *Mathematics, teaching for an outside program usually involves a pre-negotiated Memorandum of Understanding between program and Mathematics in which the program compensates Mathematics financially (with funds then used to hire a replacement tempFTE) and the faculty member teaches the outside course as part of their teaching load. No department elaborated on perceived benefits or disadvantages.
6. Both Chemistry/Biochemistry and Physics mention the variability in enrollments and contact hours between different courses in a diverse curriculum as a major challenge to achieve equity. Chemistry/Biochemistry tries to plan the teaching assignments over a 2-3 year period, which helps in achieving equity in the long term. Chemistry/Biochemistry also has an Education Council that reviews teaching assignments for overall equity. In Physics, the Chair and Vice-Chair of Education oversee the teaching assignments. In *Mathematics, teaching assignments are decided by the Vice-Chair for Undergraduate Affairs and the Chair, after review by the department's Council.
7. Physics has no established process for modifying workload standards or policies, but suggests that any proposal in this direction would be discussed by the full faculty in a faculty meeting and then voted upon. Chemistry/Biochemistry has a Department Council, consisting of the Section leadership, that discusses issues of this type. For a major change, the Council would also take the issue to the full faculty for discussion and consideration. The procedure in *Mathematics is similar to that in Chemistry/Biochemistry. The Council and Chair would consider the change and if it is major, it would go to the full faculty for consideration.

4.5. Division of Social Sciences

1. Teaching Workload Standards - There are ten departments in the Social Sciences. The annual course load for ladder rank faculty (LRF) in six departments in the Division is 4, including 3 undergraduate classes/1 graduate class. In some cases, where graduate programs are large (e.g. EDS) or undergraduate teaching needs are greater than graduate needs (e.g., Communications), the balance between graduate and undergraduate courses varies. Three departments have approved annual course loads of 3.5 for ladder rank faculty, including 2.5 undergraduate classes/1 graduate class. In some cases, however, faculty teach above these loads as reflected in departmental responses. Teaching professors (LSOEs) teach 6 courses annually across departments.

None of the departments grant course credit for mentoring/lab work/honors thesis supervision with the exception of Psychology which provides one course credit annually for these combined activities. However, granting course credit for this kind of work has been raised as an issue for discussion in two departments.

Some departments require that faculty teach at least one large undergraduate course. Two departments provide extra course credit based on large class sizes. Anthropology grants an extra 0.5 teaching credit for courses over 200, and Economics grants 0.25 credits for course over 200, and 0.5 extra for courses over 350 students.

Teaching expectations appear to be widely understood by faculty in departments, but not necessarily articulated in policy documents. Two departments (Political Science and Linguistics) noted that teaching expectations were clearly noted in faculty offer letters, and two others (Sociology and Cognitive Science) have teaching load guidelines available to all faculty on their department website (password protected) or drive.

2. Teaching relief - In 8 of 10 departments in the Social Sciences, Chairs receive a 2-course release annually. In Communication and Economics, they receive 3 course releases. At least half of the departments noted that new faculty also receive 1 course release in their first year. All but two departments (Cognitive Science, Psychology) provide teaching release to faculty for significant service duties within the department. Seven departments noted that they provide 1 course release to the Director of Graduate Studies, and 3 departments also provide 1 course release to the Director of Undergraduate Studies or 0.5 in the case of one department. Program directors (e.g., Linguistics Language Program, Joint Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership) also receive 1 course release. Numerous departments noted that they honor teaching

releases for campus service, such as CAP chair or director of an interdisciplinary program; these are paid by the EVC or the Dean.

Two departments (Communication and Anthropology) provide a course release for junior faculty completing manuscripts or books prior to tenure. Communication also provides a course release to faculty teaching a large class for the first time. Cognitive Science provides a course release when government funding is contingent upon it. Economics notes that they provide different amounts of course relief (from 0.33 up) for a variety of service responsibilities including chairing recruitment and retention committees and will provide further details upon request.

3. Service expectations - Departments in the Social Sciences report that service expectations for junior faculty are very limited as compared to more senior faculty, and expectations increase by rank. For example, assistant professors may be expected to serve on a departmental committee and engage in reviewing of manuscripts within their field, whereas tenured faculty, particularly full professors, are expected to chair committees and perform significant service at the campus level and in the field. In most cases, service expectations are generally understood rather than stated in policy guidelines. However, two departments (Cognitive Science and Psychology) have very specific guidelines regarding service. Cognitive Science and Linguistics also include expectations regarding contributions to diversity.
4. Online courses - Only 2 of the 10 departments offer online courses: Education Studies (two courses) and Psychology (“very few”). Education Studies considers online teaching as equivalent to face-to-face teaching, although this is a topic of ongoing discussion. The online courses in Psychology are considered off-load unless there is a fixed time and place component for UC San Diego students. Cognitive Science offers a non-credit “skill improvement” online course; this does not figure into workload. Economics has considerable online video material, but this is used as a component of face-to-face courses. Anthropology and Economics expressed interest in developing fully online courses.
5. Teaching outside the department - In all but two departments (Education Studies and Psychology) faculty regularly teach courses outside the department; this teaching is treated as part of the faculty workload. Much of the outside teaching seems to be voluntary, while, in some cases, it is governed by MOUs. Many departments noted advantages to having faculty teach elsewhere, including service to the university, inter-departmental relationships, enrollments (which count towards Temp FTE allocations),

visibility of the discipline, TA opportunities, and contributions to the intellectual life of the campus. Several departments noted the need to balance teaching inside and outside the department, paying attention to departmental curricular needs. A few noted that teaching in other units did not contribute to the department's TA FTE allocation.

6. Challenges to achieving an equitable workload and potential remedies - All departments discussed challenges, particularly in the distribution of teaching responsibilities. These include graduate versus undergraduate teaching, teaching large versus smaller courses, and teaching introductory versus upper-division courses. One department mentioned internal strife due to a few faculty not pulling their weight; another mentioned inequities that arise from course reduction due to retention efforts and competing offers. Only a few departments discussed mechanisms to ensure equity: rotating introductory courses, negative merit reviews (for recalcitrant faculty), and committee recommendations. Other areas of potential inequity include advising loads - both graduate and mentoring of underrepresented students - and varying degrees of service activity.
7. Processes for modifying workload standards - One department (Economics) recently successfully argued for a course workload reduction; the arguments were data-supported and involved working with the Dean's office and securing EVC approval. Communication is planning a fall retreat to discuss workload standards and other departmental issues. Two departments (Cognitive Science and Linguistics) have formed committees to look into the matter. The remaining departments do not seem to have addressed this, but several suggested that they would appoint a committee if they were to do so. There was no discussion of how workload modifications have been or will be monitored, except one department, where this would be the responsibility of the chair and MSO.

4.6 School of Global Policy and Strategy

1. As a professional school, teaching workloads are not complicated by the need to teach undergraduates and graduates. GPS faculty have a standard workload of 4 courses per year. GPS core classes carry a 2 course-credit given the size of the core classes compared to their other courses and intensive student interaction when teaching the common core. Second year capstone courses also carry a 2 course-credit. All of GPS faculty are expected to mentor master students, serve on PhD committees and provide informal teaching activities as part of their appointment. No workload credit is given for these activities. GPS does not have a written document of teaching workload standards; but the expectations are communicated during the hiring process.
2. Course relief is given for a few departmental service responsibilities such as associate deans, director of research centers with high external relations responsibilities, and a few committee chairs with extensive work. These position holders receive one course relief. Teaching relief might also be requested by faculty as part of a retention package.
3. GPS expects faculty to serve at the school, campus, and professional level. Junior faculty are expected to serve on a limited number of committees as members. Additionally, they are expected to serve professionally as reviewers or editors. Campus service is not expected at the junior level. Senior faculty are expected to serve as committee chairs, heavy lifting committees such as Admissions, and serve on campus committees as requested. They are also expected to serve professionally when approached.
4. GPS does not offer online courses to degree seeking students. GPS is developing their first online course which will be marketed to an external audience. These courses will be taught in overload.
5. GPS has close ties with Political Science and Economics. Several of their faculty have joint or adjunct appointments in those departments. Faculty teach undergraduate and Ph.D. level courses in these departments. GPS considers those courses to be part of the standard 4 course load. There are perceived benefits to campus to allow GPS faculty to teach in the Ph.D. programs as a contribution to graduate level teaching since GPS do not have a Ph.D. program. It is also a benefit to GPS faculty to engage with Ph.D. students. GPS also considers contributions to undergraduate teaching to be part of the mission of the school. In recent years GPS has begun allocating faculty teaching to undergraduates, and average 5 large undergraduate courses each year within ISP, Economics, Political Science, and Rady School. Additionally, GPS faculty expose undergraduates to their program, especially when teaching in the International Studies Program which has a 5-year BA/MIA with GPS. At this time, they do not see

disadvantages to GPS. If GPS continues to grow this may change as the need for courses will increase.

6. GPS is a small, cohesive unit. Much effort is made at the beginning of the school year to develop faculty committee assignments that are fair and equitable. Attention is given to having senior and junior faculty carry appropriate service responsibilities according to their rank.
7. GPS does not have a process for modifying workload standards.

4.7 School of Medicine

Overview and Executive Summary. The School of Medicine comprises 20 Departments. There is considerable variation amongst departments in the teaching workload; this workload is greatly influenced by the extent of department participation in undergraduate and postgraduate education, as well as participation in education outside the department. Elements that are common to most departments include teaching that is provided primarily in small groups in the clinical setting, teaching of School of Medicine courses with a team approach wherein faculty teach small portions of a course that is determined primarily by faculty expertise, and inclusion of mentoring, which includes undergraduate and postgraduate students, in the determination of workload. The teaching workload is quantified by a common Teaching Form developed by the SOM (see Appendix 3), and this form permits an assessment of the workload across Departments. Importantly, teaching is expected of all faculty, as part of being within an academic medical school and its requirement for purposes for faculty promotion; and as such, no further compensation is provided.

Responses to Survey Questions

1. In general, most Departments do not have formal teaching standards. All faculty, however, are expected to have a defined teaching role that may include participation in formal School of Medicine courses, small group seminars and discussions, conferences (Morbidity and Mortality conferences, Grand Rounds, etc.), clinical teaching in health sciences (clinics, hospital wards, laboratories), problem-based learning discussions, and small group teaching sessions directed at specific student populations (medical students, interns, residents, fellows). Direct mentoring of medical students, residents, fellows, undergraduate and postgraduate students is included in the teaching workload. Given the nature of medical education, class size is generally not of relevance, with the possible exception of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. The requirements for teaching, which are essential to the promotion process, are stipulated in departmental guidelines (see Appendix 3). These guidelines are posted on the departmental intranet. Teaching workload is quantified in the SOM Teaching Form (see Appendix 3). As mentioned, the use of a common teaching form permits a comparison of teaching workloads across the SOM. In formal SOM courses, team teaching is the approach that is commonly taken. Faculty do not teach whole courses; individual faculty provide instruction within courses on subject matters wherein they have expertise.
2. Most departments do not have formal criteria for teaching relief. The majority of teaching in health sciences occurs within a clinical setting; much of this education is provided by teams and relief is obtained when faculty are not on clinical rotation. For more formal courses, teaching relief request is initiated by faculty and negotiated with the Department Chair or Section Chief. Relief is usually provided to prevent burnout and when faculty assume new administrative duties or initiate new research projects.

Faculty at the Assistant Professor rank also have a reduced teaching load. The relief takes the form of one term of relief or reduced teaching load.

3. All faculty are expected to contribute to the governance of the department and campus in some meaningful way. For university service, faculty are expected to serve on school committees, health system committees, and/or campus committees (at least one category per academic review period). For public service, they are expected to serve on editorial boards, study sections, scientific advisory boards, professional organization projects, professional organization offices, professional organization committees, grant applications reviews, and/or service to community organizations and groups (at least one category per academic review period). For ladder rank, in-residence and adjunct faculty, external service is expected as is the development of a national and international reputation in their respective fields. The expectations of service vary by faculty rank. Service expectations are modest for faculty at the Assistant Professor rank and they increase as faculty advance in the promotion process. Faculty service requirements are stipulated in departmental guidelines; these guidelines are posted on the individual department intranet (see Appendix 3).
4. Online courses are not offered by the four Departments that submitted the workload survey.
5. For these departments, with the exception of FMPH (which has the largest number of undergraduate students enrolled in Health Science), teaching outside of the Department counts (and is encouraged) towards Department teaching obligations, so long as the departmental teaching is not impaired. With split-FTE appointments with other departments it is expected that teaching will occur in both. The benefit of extradepartmental teaching is exposure of faculty to students in other disciplines, building teaching skills and expertise, as well as having the potential opportunity to garner additional FTE/salary support through collaboration. The disadvantage is that faculty are expected to spend more time in their teaching, perhaps to the detriment of their research.
6. Faculty with clinical obligations are challenged by having to balance clinical work with teaching and with scholarly/creative activity. The challenges are occasionally resolved by counting teaching of residents and fellows as teaching rather than clinical service. The majority of faculty in departments are in the non-Academic Senate Health Sciences Clinical series and a substantial proportion of the teaching workload is borne by these faculty. This allows Academic Senate faculty to moderate their teaching workload in order to devote greater time to scholarship and to service. Faculty compensation is driven by clinical productivity and there is no additional compensation for teaching. Education is an accepted obligation of all faculty given their employment in an academic medical school, regardless of rank. It is also a requirement for the academic promotion

process. Some Departments have a formal process for assessment of workload wherein an education committee monitors workload and its distribution across all faculty to try to ensure equity.

7. The four Departments that responded to the survey do not have formal policies for evaluation of workload and its medication.

4.8 Rady School of Management

1. The teaching load for Rady LRF is 3.0 regular courses per year. All LRF are expected to teach in the Master's level programs, including the self-supporting programs: it is a requirement for our business model. Faculty are expected to engage in student mentoring and supervision but there is no formal system for crediting faculty for such activities. Teaching in the Ph.D. and UG programs by LRF is considered on a case-by-case basis. Most LRF do not teach in the UG programs and the relatively small size of the Ph.D. program warrants the allocation of only a few LRF to teach Ph.D. courses. In some cases, we have LRF faculty initially teach in the UG minors as part of their load in order to support development of the teaching skills required in the Master's level programs.

For LSOEs, Rady School adheres to the campus policy of 6.0 regular courses per year. As Rady is very new to the LSOE series, it is possible that a reduced load will be considered in the future for administrative duties.

Faculty do get credits for supervision of independent projects. The School has a formal "Independent Study Policy" that pertains only to our MBA programs, both state- and self-supporting, whereby faculty can earn an offset or credit of 1.0 regular courses when 60 or more academic units is earned through supervision of independent study projects in a rolling three-year period. Use of a 1.0 course relief earned in this way is at the discretion of the associate dean and the academic programs, based on instructional needs. A copy of Rady's Independent Study Policy is attached in Appendix 3.

2. As a self-supporting academic unit, Rady depends heavily on our regular ranks to teach a full load, and requests for course relief are managed carefully. The School routinely provides for 1.0 course relief for all new faculty and 1.0 course per year for associate deans and the Ph.D. program director. Central campus programs mandating course reduction, such as ASMD and FCDP, can cause heavy financial burdens for the School, given that business school replacement faculty are far costlier than the tempFTE support provided. Other requests for course relief – for example, course buyout from research funds – are considered on a case-by-case basis.
3. Rady does not expect their non-tenured faculty to contribute much to service, mostly asking them to help with activities that will further their professional development such as organizing seminars (helping them to build their professional networks), recruiting new faculty, and serving occasionally on internal committees that do not involve much additional work. They ask more of Associate Professors, and more still of Full Professors. Both groups (particularly the latter group) are expected to serve on campus committees and to provide active professional services as journal reviewers, conference organizers and, if sufficiently senior, as associate and managing editors of journals in their areas.

4. At this time, there is only one hybrid course offered on a semi-regular basis in our undergraduate program. Rady does not yet have a policy for how to credit or compensate for this type of activity, but it is an important consideration for the future evolution of our school and the campus.
5. Given the cost of Rady faculty, and their understanding that they are only responsible for teaching 3.0 courses, these would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Overload teaching is possible, provided that the School's needs are met before all others. If faculty volunteer, their pro bono commitment elsewhere should be explicit, though if research funding or summer ninths are offered, that could also be considered on a case-by-case basis. Rady has a number of UCSD faculty from other academic units on campus involved in teaching, and Rady supports them in a variety of ways. Some Ph.D. courses are co-listed between Economics and Rady and faculty have traditionally received full course credits for teaching these shared courses.
6. It has been a challenge to Rady trying to balance the types of courses they need to offer with the total number of students to be taught, given that Rady's programs are self-supporting and those students represent revenue contributed to their general fund that supports faculty salary and their summer research support program. Rady has a few ideas under discussion, but has not yet come to agreement on the policies for implementation. A key issue in designing a points system is how to assign different weights to classes with small versus large enrollment and to core classes versus electives.
7. No process in place. Rady is self-supporting, so any proposal would have to be equitable and financially viable.

4.9 Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO)

Scripps is a large single department with 3 major educational areas covered by the Ocean Biosciences Program (OBP), the Climate Oceans and Atmosphere Program (COAP), and Geosciences of Earth, Oceans, and Planets (GEOP), each with majors at both undergraduate (UG) and graduate levels. Additionally, Scripps is the administrative home for the interdisciplinary UG Environmental Systems Program. Program chairs for OBP, COAP, and GEOP are responsible for curriculum and teaching within each area in coordination with 8 distinct graduate curriculum group coordinators and Undergraduate Programs Director oversees steering committees for each individual major.

1. SIO has a formal teaching policy for ladder rank professors. The standard is for a 100% academic year appointee to teach a minimum of 6 student credit units per year when averaged over an academic review cycle. There is currently no explicit requirement about how these are distributed across undergraduate and graduate courses, except some department chairs encourage faculty to develop an appropriate mix.

The policy is posted under SIO Teaching Standards along with other SIO policies at <https://scripps.ucsd.edu/resources-and-facilities/employee-resources/scripps-policies> and a copy of the version approved in 2014 is attached in Appendix 3. Some forms of teaching, such as large (>200 enrolled) and newly developed classes are given higher weight (1.5 times student credit units). Mentoring and informal teaching are also expected, but no quantitative measure is used for these efforts. Faculty are responsible for advising, and financially supporting, graduate students. The ad hoc review committees and the Department chair can comment on excellence and deficiencies in this area at the normal times for review.

SIO teaching professors are expected to teach up to 6 classes (4 units each) per year, with the exact requirement depending on other responsibilities associated with the specific educational programs. More than 15 professors hold joint appointments with other departments, and their teaching at SIO is covered by MOUs negotiated with the other department chairs. Typically, the 6-unit standard is pro-rated by the fraction of FTE at SIO.

2. The standard applies to ALL SIO Professors regardless of rank except during times of sabbatical leaves and family accommodations. New appointees are generally not required to teach during the first year of their appointment to allow time for establishing their research programs. Faculty taking on extraordinary administrative tasks may negotiate teaching relief with the dean at the time of appointment. Chairs of UCSD Academic Senate or UCSD CAP receive one course (4 units) relief. To date some Associate Dean, Deputy Director for Research, and Deputy Director for Education (Department Chair) appointees have requested relief. Typical magnitude is a reduction from 6 to 4 units/year averaged over a review cycle. Graduate and undergraduate

program chairs do not currently receive teaching relief. These tasks are considered part of a faculty member's service profile. Almost all faculty meet or exceed the SIO teaching minimum, including many of those who might reasonably be expected to be in a position to negotiate teaching relief.

3. SIO does not have formal service requirements. However, all faculty are expected to participate in campus service (SIO and UCSD wide), and the quality and quantity is evaluated as part of academic reviews. The amount of service expected increases considerably as professors rise through the ranks. Where needed the Department Chair recommends more or less effort, usually at the time of regular academic review. Several junior joint appointees have noted that service in two departments may not be easily pro-rated along with fractional appointments.
4. Two online courses have so far been developed and offered by SIO faculty. The workload associated with their development has been substantial and this has been remarked on during academic reviews.
5. Teaching contributing to the standard may be carried out in other departments at the discretion of Chair. Benefits arise for joint appointees and interdisciplinary curriculum development. In some cases, classes can be co-scheduled, broadening horizons for students. Difficulties occasionally arise when it appears that a professor is not serving any SIO students. Faculty with split appointments teach at SIO proportional to their percentage appointment unless otherwise negotiated by the faculty member and Chair.
6. One challenge that remains, especially among some senior professors, is in ensuring that all faculty contribute to teaching at all levels, rather than specializing in small classes at the graduate level. All assignments are reviewed on an annual basis, and those who are perceived as not doing their share are gently guided to take on more appropriate tasks. All faculty now know that sub-par contributions are subject to comment at the time of academic review and may impact their advancement. However, this may have little effect on those who have already reached the highest ranks of the professoriate.
7. The process for modifying teaching expectations is referred to the SIO Faculty's Educational Policy Committee, and any recommendation is followed by SIO faculty wide discussion and vote. Results are disseminated to the faculty and implemented by the Program Chairs and Curricular group coordinators who are responsible for recommending teaching assignments that are ultimately approved by the Department Chair.

5. Summary and Recommendations

This report summarizes the efforts of a Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Workload (referred to as the Workgroup) assembled in 2018 to gather the workload standards in disciplines across the UC San Diego campus. The Workgroup was comprised of 15 members from various Divisions/Schools at UC San Diego. The original Workgroup charge was (amongst other things), to primarily collect and document departmental workload and scholarly standards for all General Campus, SIO and Health Sciences departments. The Workgroup was also tasked with recommending a process through which departments can propose to modify their workload standards, apply for necessary approvals (e.g. for changing teaching standards), and inform the appropriate University offices of the new standards. The Workgroup decided to focus this effort on primarily teaching, and also (though secondarily) service, workload standards; as scholarly standards vary significantly across campus. The Workgroup prepared a set of survey questions for Departments and distributed them via email to Department Chairs; the questions focused on collecting information regarding faculty teaching and service. Information provided by each Department is organized in the present report; and the Workgroups observations and recommendations are summarized herein.

5.1 Overarching Observations

An overall observation is that 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. Strategies for accounting for informal teaching, mentoring, and advising both undergraduate and graduate students are also quite variable with some parts of campus providing detailed point systems while others allowing a generic evaluation of effort invested during the normal academic review process. Also, some School of Medicine teaching occurs in clinical settings and through teaching small portions of a course. The following summary points pertain primarily to the general campus and to some extent SIO.

- Most departments have teaching load standards that are known by faculty, and in some cases also clearly articulated in formal policies. These standards are typically revised in consultation with the faculty as a whole or with a committee within the Department.
- 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). Some departments give more credit for teaching large enrollment classes, with larger courses weighted more heavily (standards vary among departments/units), while others consider these variations are naturally accounted for in the assignment of TAs and readers. Some departments/units incorporate mentoring in teaching standards. The teaching load for LSOEs is typically 6 courses per year across the campus.

- Departments vary in the extent to which courses taught in other programs or departments is considered on load or overload. Some departments in Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences recognize the need to contribute to college writing and interdisciplinary programs and count these courses towards the faculty load, but this may come at a cost to departments. In most other cases, teaching outside the department is considered overload.
- Course relief for department chairs varies from two courses to full course relief, and this does not seem to relate to department size. Most departments have guidelines for granting course reliefs to other faculty, with established amounts for particular service roles.
- 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.
- 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 the departmental input, the amount of teaching required appears to have a natural variability across campus. It is also clear that the effort invested by individual faculty members may in fact be quite variable depending on numbers and qualifications of students, class level, laboratory or field instruction, and other factors.

The workgroup concluded that, given the diversity of subject matter and educational strategies across campus, it is normal for there to be no single standard, that can be applied everywhere. Enforcing such a standard might have detrimental effects on UC San Diego's teaching and research enterprise. Nevertheless, it is important to establish measurable and equitable standards within each department. An area that might deserve attention is the apparently uneven distribution of teaching relief in some departments; and in some cases it is not clear if the same teaching credit adjustment for large size classes (or other considerations) is given to LRF and LSOE. The committee could find no good reason for allocating permanent relief as part of faculty retention offers, and felt that it risks building ill-will within departments granting this. Likewise, it seems important to rotate teaching tasks as needed on a regular basis to ensure equitable divisions of workload.

Department and campus-wide service remains challenging to evaluate. Nonetheless, the most consistent standard appears to be the expectation of an increasing service load on rising through the professorial ranks. Some departments lower teaching workload in response to service contributions within the department (e.g. graduate advisers, UG curriculum chair...)

while others do not. Documentation of service is a more complex issue and might require intrusive effort to determine how much time individuals actually invest in service activities, and assessment of the quality of their engagement. Where campus service involves academic senate committee or equivalent membership, it is notable that time commitments are more transparent and thus readily plausible for faculty to document.

5.2 Recommendations

The committee recommends that every department maintains a transparent record of individual faculty member's teaching load, any approved teaching relief, and how this relates to overall department standards. Departments wishing to modify teaching workload standards should document the current expectations and provide a cogent rationale for proposed changes, for instance, improvements to workload balance across the department; increase in number of students/classes to be taught that cannot be addressed through new faculty recruitments thus requiring a larger teaching load; need to reduce faculty teaching loads to rebalance fractions of time spent on teaching, service, and research; change in educational programs being offered by the department that require rebalancing teaching portfolios. Any such changes should first be discussed at the department level; they may require consultation with the dean, and others involved in resource allocation; proposals to change teaching workload should be sent to Educational Policy Council for Senate input; results should be communicated to all Department Faculty, Deans of Graduate Division and Undergraduate Education, with the office of the Dean of Undergraduate Education maintaining all the workload records. Finally, in regard to academic senate service at the divisional and systemwide levels, the Workgroup would like to remind the readers that faculty participation is an absolute essential for shared governance to work at the University of California.

Appendix 1: Charge Letter to the Workgroup

Appendix 2: Department survey inputs

Appendix 3: Departments' faculty rank and merit advancement documents

Appendix 4: Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

ASMD	Active Service Modified Duties
BE	Department of BioEngineering
CAP	(Academic Senate) Committee on Academic Personnel
CAT	Culture, Art, and Technology courses at the Sixth College
COAP	Climate Oceans and Atmosphere Program of SIO
CSE	Department of Computer Science and Engineering
DOC	Dimensions of Culture courses at the Marshall College
D.M.A.	Doctor of Musical Arts
ECE	Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
EDS	Department of Education Studies
ERC	Eleanor Roosevelt College
FCDP	Faculty Career Development Program
G	Graduate
GEOP	Geosciences of Earth, Oceans, and Planets Program of SIO
GPS	School of Global Policy and Strategy
HUM	Humanities courses at the Revelle College
ISP	International Studies Program
JSOE	Jacobs School of Engineering
L(P)SOE	Lecturer with (potential) security of employment; they are the ladder-ranked teaching professors.
LRF	Ladder-ranked faculty; still commonly this has been interpreted as ladder-ranked professor with both research and teaching responsibility.
MAE	Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
MFA	Master of Fine Arts
MIA	Master of International Affairs
MMW	Making of the Modern World courses at the ERC
NE	Department of Nano-Engineering
OBP	Ocean Biosciences Program of SIO
Overload	(same as aboveload) Workload above the normal workload
SE	Department of Structural Engineering
SIO	Scripps Institution of Oceanography
SOM	School of Medicine
TempFTE	Temporary full-time employee units
Teaching workload	Total number of course taught during the FWS quarters.
UG	Undergraduate
Workload	For faculty this refers to the teaching load