SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
PARKS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, AVIATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Policy Number PARKS-001   v1.7. Revised: August 18, 2017
Effective Date: January 1, 2018

FACULTY WORKLOAD AND ANNUAL EVALUATION POLICY

PURPOSE: To establish the policy and procedures by which Parks College faculty members are assigned workload and evaluated on an annual basis.

SCOPE: Applies to all full-time faculty members with regular appointments in Parks College funded through college or department unrestricted operating accounts as described in Section III.D.1 of the Faculty Manual of Saint Louis University.

DEFINITIONS: Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty – faculty with the titles Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor as defined in as defined in Section III.D.1 of the Faculty Manual of Saint Louis University.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty – faculty with the titles Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor as defined in as defined in Section III.D.2 of the Faculty Manual of Saint Louis University.

Additional definitions used in this document are consistent with the definitions found in the University Policy on Faculty Workload.

POLICY

I. General

This Parks College of Engineering, Aviation and Technology (Parks) policy falls within a greater hierarchy of laws, statutes and rules. College policies are subject to compliance with laws and regulations instituted by higher governing authorities as follows:

  A. Federal laws and regulations
  B. State laws and administrative rules
  C. University policies and procedures
  D. Parks College of Engineering, Aviation and Technology policies and procedures

This workload and annual evaluation policy supplements, and is consistent with, the University Policy on Faculty Workload. It is presented in order to address three important issues:
  A. Fair and productive allocation of workload among the faculty throughout Parks College
  B. Optimization of faculty effort in order to maximize the research productivity within Parks College
  C. Efficient and effective delivery of education to Parks College students

The central administration recently produced workload guidelines that provide boundary conditions within which the Parks College Guidelines will operate. The Parks College policies

1

must operate in concert with faculty annual evaluations. Guidelines for Parks Faculty workload allocation are addressed in Part II of this document, and annual evaluations are addressed in Part III of this document.

It is the responsibility of all faculty members to be engaged in the pursuit of excellence in generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge. The distribution of workload assignments for a tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure-track academic faculty member will be determined in accordance with the mission and priorities of the University and the goals and needs of that faculty member's governing unit. All workload assignments shall be consistent with the University Policy on Faculty Workload, as well as the policies and bylaws of the faculty member's governing department or equivalent units and college. Each faculty member's workload will be distributed over an agreed-upon allocation of activities in the areas of teaching, research and service.

The responsibility of each university tenured/tenure-track or non-tenure-track faculty member should be determined in such a way that each person can make significant contributions toward achievement of Saint Louis University's mission. Fulfillment of the mission of the University requires effective instruction, research and institutional service, academic program development, curricular design, and professional renewal and development.

Faculty assignments and, subsequently, the opportunity, recognition, and rewards for realization of those assignments must align with the University's mission. Equitable workload policies should recognize and respect the demands that activities place on a faculty member's time, and should be designed to best utilize each faculty member's individual strengths.

Recognizing the great diversity among colleges and units as to the specific nature of their work, the University Policy on Faculty Workload provides the basic principles on which faculty workload assignment and distribution decisions are based.

The faculty should participate fully in providing input into the determination of workload policy in each college, department, and/or unit, both initially and in all subsequent reappraisals.

II. Workload Allocation

Faculty members and department chairs work together to negotiate workload for the coming year annually toward the end of the calendar year. Workload units can be converted to percentage effort and thus provide weights to be applied to the annual evaluation scores in teaching, research, and service. This weighting is termed the teaching, research, or service "workload fraction" in the annual evaluation document.

A. These guidelines are designed to allow department chairs the flexibility to exercise judgment in assigning workloads to both optimize each department's productivity but also allow chairs to be entrepreneurial in the use of resources and in the development of their units.

B. Chairs must keep in mind the development of both the research and the teaching programs of their new faculty members. New faculty members should have limited new preparations throughout their pre-tenure period and their workloads should also be adjusted to allow them time to develop their research programs.

C. New preparations include the development of course materials for the first offering of a particular course by an instructor. Significant course redesign includes creating new course materials for a class that the instructor has not taught for more than four years, or a significant change in the delivery method or course syllabus for a course that has been taught by the instructor within the previous four years.

D. Each unit and the College as a whole strives to deliver an effective education in the most efficient manner with respect to faculty resources. This efficiency is necessary in order to give faculty as a whole the maximum time to develop the College's research agenda.

E. The University Policy on Faculty Workload specifies a standard of 24 yearly workload units for all faculty members on nine-month contracts. These workload units are distributed across teaching, research and scholarship, and service duties.

F. A faculty member's effort distribution for each year should be determined in a discussion between a faculty member and his or her chair during the *previous year's annual evaluation*. The determination of faculty workload will include the teaching and research needs of the department and college, the faculty member's interests and professional goals, and resources available. This timing also aids in course scheduling for the following academic year.

G. Table 1 lists the number of workload units associated with each of the standard faculty activities. It is important to note that these guidelines are general and not intended to articulate every specific activity in which a faculty member engages. Details on, for example, the number of graduate students a faculty member mentors, the number of committees on which a faculty member serves, or the total number of publications are to be addressed in the annual evaluation. It is critical not to attempt to micromanage individuals' time and effort. Credit for increased effort in any given area will be identified in the annual evaluation for a faculty member.

H. Table 2 lists the number of workload units associated with each of the standard faculty activities for administrators on eleven-month contracts.

I. The minimum workload assigned for teaching is six workload units per year, except in the case of new faculty members in their first year.

J. Application of the workload units described in Tables 1 and 2 should be done in a manner that is both retrospective and prospective and represents approximately a three-year moving average for each category. For example, a faculty member who has lost research funding does not immediately have his or her teaching workload increased without having a chance to regain funding, unless the faculty member and chair agree to an alternate arrangement.

K. The monetary values provided in the Grants and Contracts columns of Tables 1 and 2 should be taken as guidelines. Research grants with somewhat lower dollar amounts, but which are especially prestigious or which represent high levels of funding for the specific research domain may move to a higher category.

L. The workload guidelines allow for variable distribution of effort. If a faculty member has a teaching intensive workload he or she should be eligible to receive a high annual

evaluation score and, when available, a correspondingly strong merit increase. The same goes for a faculty member with a research-intensive workload.

Table 1. Workload units allocated for various faculty activities. These are general guidelines and some unit details may vary by department. All faculty members on nine-month contracts are required to have 24 workload units allocated each calendar year.

Service and Professional Development	Teaching	Research and Scholarship	
		Research	Grants and Contracts
The service workload for a faculty member should include committees and academic support for the university as well as professional development. **1-5 units**	Each lecture course credit hour that is taught individually – **1 unit**	Faculty members who are publishing, giving external presentations, or have SLU managed patents. Faculty should average 1 peer reviewed journal article, book, book chapter, patent or conference presentation every year – **1-3 units**	Faculty serving as PI on grants or contracts totaling on the order of $360k (total direct + indirect) over a three year period– 9 **units**
	Each laboratory course credit hour that is taught individually – 1.0-**1.5 units**	Faculty members serving as research or project mentors for undergraduate or graduate students doing work leading to publication or presentation **1-3 units**	Faculty serving as PI on grants or contracts totaling on the order of $250k (total direct + indirect) over a three year period – 6 **units**
	Each credit hour of a new course preparation or significant course redesign – **1.5-2.0 units** see II.C for a definition of new course preparation		Pre-tenure faculty member who is developing a sustainable independent research program and actively submitting at least two grants or contracts each year – 6 **units**
	Each credit hour of a course requiring significant instructor-student or industry interaction – **1.5-2.0 units**		Tenured faculty who do not hold active grants but are actively writing external grant proposals - **1-3 units**
	Large lecture courses with undergraduate enrollments of ≥ 40 students or graduate enrollments of ≥ 20 students – **1 extra unit per 3CH course**		Faculty serving as PI on grants and contracts totaling between on the order of $50K and $250K (direct + indirect) over a 3 year period – **4 units**
	Each Flight Science flight laboratory group that is taught individually (based on 2.5 to 3 contact hours per week) – **1 unit**		Faculty serving as PI on grants and contracts totaling ≤ 50K (direct + indirect) over a 3 year period, or with internal grants totaling ≥ 25K or if serving as co-PI on a major grant or contract – **2 units**

	Each Flight Science scheduled student flight slot (6 contact hours per week) – **1.5 units**		Faculty serving as Co-PI, co-I or other key personnel on grants or contracts will be given a share of the workload units based on percent effort and/or subaward amount
	Each Flight Science complete Intermediate Stage and End of Course Exams (3 contact hours on average) – **0.2 units per exam**		
	Courses not included in this area are: Undergrad and grad research, thesis, dissertation and special topics small enrollments		
3 units represents a standard load	Minimum of **6 units** in this column		Total in this column cannot exceed **9 units**

Table 2. Workload units allocated for various faculty activities for Department Chairs and Associate Deans within Parks College. All administrators in Parks College are contracts of eleven-month duration are required to have 29 workload units.

Service and Professional Development	Teaching	Research and Scholarship		Administrative
		Research	Grants and Contracts	
Standard service and professional development workload for administrators – **1 - 2 units**	Same as for nine-month faculty. See Table 1.	Same as for nine-month faculty. See Table 1.	Same as for nine-month faculty. See Table 1.	Administrative loads are only applied to faculty serving as Chair, Associate Dean, Director of Graduate Programs or Chief Instructor – **10-14 units** (**12 units** represents a standard load)
Chief Instructor – **2 units**				
Increased service load for administrators with substantial committee, professional development or academic support requirements – **3 - 4 units**				

III. Annual Evaluations

Annual evaluations are conducted each calendar year for all tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty members by the faculty member's department chair. Generally, they are conducted for a calendar year within the two months following the year's end according to the university annual faculty evaluation schedule. The paragraphs below spell out the process by which annual evaluations are quantified.

A. All materials for faculty annual reviews (FAR) should be entered through the University's Activity Insight interface. Everyone should include his or her workload distribution for the current year (represented as percentage effort devoted to each area) that was decided upon during the previous year's annual evaluation.

B. Teaching, research, and service activities for the past year are evaluated based on the point system outlined in Tables 3 through 5 below for tenured and tenure-track faculty members, and using Tables 6 through 8 for non-tenure-track faculty members.

C. Productivity points are assigned for each activity in a given category based on the appropriate table. Then, for each area (teaching, research, service), each faculty member is ranked within the department based on his or her point total and then assigned a score of 1 – 4. The numbers 1 – 4 correspond to the following performance levels:

1. below expectations
2. meets expectations
3. exceeds expectations
4. outstanding

D. Productivity points across categories are not meant to correlate with total effort.

E. The numbers of points per each item for research teaching and service are listed in tables 3 through 5 below for all tenure-track faculty members. Non-tenure-track faculty members have a different form and evaluation system. Associated points systems for non-tenure track faculty members are listed in Tables 7 through 9.

F. Tables 3 through 8 are suggested point allocations for various activities. Departments within Parks College may vary these point allocations based on their unit's priorities and goals as long as they are varied consistently and fairly.

G. The area score is then combined with the workload fraction (from the % effort identified in each area from the faculty workload distribution) to produce a single overall annual evaluation score with a simple weighting equation:

Annual evaluation score = $X_{service} \cdot S_{service} + X_{teaching} \cdot S_{teaching} + X_{research} \cdot S_{research}$

where:
$X_{service}$ = service workload proportion
$S_{service}$ = service area score (1 to 4)

$X_{teaching}$ = teaching workload proportion
$S_{teaching}$ = teaching area score (1 to 4)

$X_{research}$ = research workload proportion
$S_{research}$ = research area score (1 to 4)

An example of a department annual evaluation output is shown in Part IV of this document.

Table 3. Productivity Points for Research Activities for Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty

Item	Points
Presentations	
Contributed by student in group	0.25
Contributed by PI	0.5
Invited	2
Patent or Publication	
when paper/patent is submitted	1
when paper/patent appears in print	3
total points for each publication/patent	4
Published Book	
when contract is obtained	2
while book is in process	1
when book is completed	3
total for book	6
Grants and Contracts	
Internal Proposal Funded	2
External Proposal Funded (< $50K) (as co-PI/co-I = 4)	7
External Proposal Funded (> $50K) (as co-PI I/co-I = 6)	10
Submit Unsuccessful External Grant (as co-PI I/co-I = 1)	3
Serving as PI on a currently externally-funded grant	5
Serving as co-PI I/co-I on a currently externally-funded grant	3

For publications, the year of submission should be indicated for all articles published during the current year.

Table 4. Productivity Points for Service Activities for Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty

Item		Points
Smaller Activity (ex. meeting with prospective students, etc.)		0.1 - 0.25
Committee Member (Department, College, or University)		2
Committee Chair (Department, College, or University)		5
Professional development activity – attendance at workshop, attendance at conference, professional consulting, attendance at short course		1-3 points
Major Activity (significant administrative responsibility, lead or chair major initiative)		6-10
External service: reviewer for papers, grant proposals		0.5 – 1 (5 max total)
External service: Chairing or organizing symposia, sessions at conferences		3
Leadership role in external/professional service		3
Undergraduate Mentoring	0-10 students	3
	11-20 students	6
	21+ students	9

Extra points will be given for committees with significant demands. For items with variable points, assigned points are determined by chair based on the demands and the payoff of the activity.

Table 5. Productivity Points for Teaching Activities for Tenure-Track or Tenured Faculty

For teaching, all faculty members receive a base score based upon the number of courses taught and the results of the student evaluations. Onto this base score are additional points for the following teaching activities. These extra points are scaled across the faculty and the additional amount is added to the base score.

Item	Points
Base Teaching Productivity	5-7
Student Satisfaction / Teaching Quality	5-7
Graduate Student Committee Member	0.5
Major course redesign	2 – 4
Developing New Course	6
Pedagogical Activity (attend conference, etc.)	1 – 5
Directing Undergraduate in Research	1/student
Directing Graduate or Postdoctoral in Research	2/student
Visiting Researcher in Laboratory	1/person
Teaching large section	3
Teaching an extra course	4

Table 6. Productivity Points for Teaching Activities for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Item	Points
Base Teaching Productivity	5-7
Student Satisfaction / Teaching Quality	5-7
Graduate Student Committee Member	0.5
Mentoring or co-Mentoring of Research Student	2
Oversight of Undergraduate Assistant	1/student
Oversight of Graduate Assistant	2/student
Oversight of Undergraduate Assistant	1/person
Oversight of Full-Time Staff	5/person
*Major course redesign	2 – 4
*Developing New Course	6
*Pedagogical Activity (attend conference, etc.)	1 – 5
*Directing Undergraduate in Research	1/student
*Directing Graduate or Postdoctoral in Research	2/student
Teaching large section	3
Teaching an extra course	4

Table 7. Productivity Points for Service Activities for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Item		Points
Smaller Activity (ex.: meeting with prospective students, etc.)		0.25
Committee Member (Department, College, or University)		2
Committee Chair (Department, College, or University)		5
Professional development activity – attendance at workshop, attendance at conference, professional consulting, attendance at short course		1-3 points
Major Activity (significant administrative responsibility, lead or chair major initiative)		6-10
External service: reviewer for papers, grant proposals		0.5 – 1 (5 max total)
External service: Chairing or organizing symposia, sessions at conferences		3
Leadership role in external/professional service		3
Undergraduate Mentoring	0-7 students	3
	7-14 students	6
	15+ students	9

Table 8. Productivity Points for Research and Pedagogical Development Activities for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Item	Points
Presentations	
Contributed	0.5
Invited	2
Patent or Publication	
when paper/patent is submitted	1
when paper/patent appears in print	3
total points for each publication/patent	4
Published Book	
when contract is obtained	2
while book is in process	1
when book is completed	3
total for book	6
Major course or curriculum redesign	2 – 8
Other Pedagogical Activity	1 – 5
Grants and Contracts	
Internal Proposal Funded	2
External Proposal or Contract Funded (as co-PI I/co-I = 4)	8
Submit Unsuccessful External Grant (as co-PI I/co-I = 1)	3
Serving as PI on a currently externally-funded grant	5
Serving as co-PI I/co-I on a currently externally-funded grant	3

IV. Example Annual Evaluation Output

Here is an example department with four faculty members. Productivity points come from the faculty member's annual activity report and the percentage effort is determined at a chair-faculty member discussion the previous year. The output of this process gives the overall annual evaluation that is used in the determination of the faculty member's annual merit salary increase.

1. Productivity points for the year in each area are tabulated for each faculty member based on their faculty annual report in Activity Insight.
2. The annual evaluation score by area is assigned by the chair based on relative faculty productivity points.
3. Percentage effort for each area is determined by the workload units for teaching, research and scholarship, and service. This distribution was decided for each faculty member during the previous year's faculty annual review. This distribution determined the teaching load for the year.
4. The overall faculty evaluation is the weighted average of the score from all three areas.
5. The overall annual evaluation score is used for the determination of faculty merit raises.

Faculty	Productivity Points for the Year			Annual Evaluation Score by Area			% Effort by Area			Overall Annual Evaluation Score
	Teaching	Research & Scholarship	Service	Teaching	Research & Scholarship	Service	Teaching	Research & Scholarship	Service	
#1	8	20	14	2	4	3	37.5	50	12.5	3.125
#2	15	5	7	3	2	2	50	37.5	12.5	2.5
#3	17	12	15	3	3	3	50	37.5	12.5	3.0
#4	25	5	19	4	2	4	75	12.5	12.5	3.75

V. Approvals

This Parks College policy was approved by the Parks College Faculty Assembly and the Dean of Parks College of Engineering, Aviation, and Technology.

Approved by Parks Faculty Assembly on April 26, 2017

Signature: _____   Date: 9-28-17

Kyle Mitchell
Chair, Parks Faculty Assembly

Signature: _____   Date: 8/22/2017

Michelle Sabick
Dean, Parks College of Engineering, Aviation and Technology

Signature: _____   Date: 9/28/17

Nancy Brickhouse
Provost, Saint Louis University