GOALS AND PURPOSE OF THE POLICY

The goals of the workload policy are to fulfill the responsibilities of the department by recognizing and supporting faculty members' diverse strengths, talents and contributions to the department and university, and to ensure equitable consideration in merit review. A normal workload for faculty includes teaching, research/scholarship activities and service. This policy is designed to ensure equity in overall workload, rather than equity in just one or two components of the workload.

APPLICATION OF THE POLICY

This policy applies to full-time faculty in the department of pharmaceutical science, including tenured/tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track teaching faculty. Although research faculty are considered full-time members of the department, their work is entirely research focused; thus, subsequent provisions of this policy are not applicable to them.

OVERARCHING EXPECTATIONS

The general expectation is that all full-time department faculty in the department will provide six “units” of work during the academic year (i.e., two academic semesters). Each Unit is equal to one 4-credit hour course (or the equivalent) worth of effort. In a theoretical case, if a faculty member were to conduct no research, receive no grant funding and provide no service, he/she would be expected to teach six courses per academic year.

All full-time department faculty are expected to provide at least one unit of institutional service. This is beyond the overall expectation of participation in the life of the department (e.g., attending seminars, colloquia and other events), and other normal activities expected of all faculty, as appropriate (e.g., faculty meetings, tenure and promotion committee meetings).

All tenured/tenure-track faculty members are expected to also have at least one unit of research/scholarship and one unit of service; therefore, a tenured/tenure track faculty member would normally teach four courses (i.e., six units of work, minus one unit each for research/scholarship and service). A faculty member with a high research profile, as defined below, would have three units of research and one unit of service, resulting in the expectation to provide two courses per academic year.

Non-tenure track teaching professors normally have no research component in their workload; thus, the six units of effort normally consist of one unit of service, and five units of teaching.
WORKLOAD EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The department shall constitute a workload evaluation committee consisting of the department chair and at least three elected full-time faculty, including tenured/tenure track faculty and teaching faculty. The primary responsibility of the workload evaluation committee is to review and comment on workload recommendations provided by the chair.

WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION DECISIONS

The department chair, after consultation with each faculty member, will recommend workload distributions for the coming year. The chair will then present the set of workload recommendations to the entire workload evaluation committee for review and comments. The committee may decide to review a particular workload assignment in further detail and offer suggestions to the chair for modifications. After discussion with the committee about the reviewed workload assignments, the chair will finalize the individual workload assignments. Normally, a workload assignment shall be made with the consent of the faculty member. Annually, the chair shall meet with each faculty member after the merit evaluation process to discuss merit review results and discuss updates regarding workload assignments.

Workload adjustments are made at the end of the academic year, following merit reviews, to be implemented the following term. However, the subsequent year's merit assessment will follow the weighting of the components of the faculty member's workload in effect at the time of the merit review. The guidelines below describe the nominal expectations for assignment of a given rating in research/scholarship, teaching and service. The extent to which a faculty member meets or exceeds, or does not meet, these expectations will be assessed at merit review time.

1. Establishing the Research/Scholarship Workload Rating. There is a two-step process for establishing the research/scholarship workload rating: First, the chair and the workload evaluation committee will use workload data submitted for (and excerpted from) the current year's merit report, along with such data from the two previous years. For the purpose of determining workload, each faculty member's research productivity will be assessed based on the number of peer-reviewed publications in a given calendar year and the level of active external funding (Table 1). In most cases, this will constitute the final research rating for the review year. Second, recognizing that differences in
productivity metrics (i.e., number of publications, levels of grant funding) may exist between sub-disciplines in the department, the chair and the workload evaluation committee will use their discretion in determining if a criterion is met for research ratings in the evaluation year.

To determine if a change should be made in research rating, the average number of research units assigned for the current year and the two previous years will be calculated, and rounded to the nearest integer. That integer will indicate the new research rating. For example, if a faculty member has had a “high research” rating (e.g., score of 3) for two of the three previous years and a “moderate research” rating (e.g., score of 2) for one of the three previous years, a three-year average of 2.67, which rounds to 3, they will be rated as “high research”. If s/he has had a “high research” rating (e.g., score of 3) for one year, that follows two consecutive years of a “moderate research” rating (e.g., score of 2), a three-year average of 2.33, which rounds to 2, they will be rated as “moderate research”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Research Units</th>
<th>Accepted Peer-Reviewed Publications</th>
<th>Share of Active or Awarded External Funding (Direct Costs Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>≥ 500k/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>or &gt;$100k/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 ≥ X &lt;5</td>
<td>or Between $50-100k/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>and &lt;$50k / year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Establishing the Service Rating. Assessment of the institutional service rating will consider principally the amount of service provided to the department and school and other service provided within the college and university (e.g., committee work, undergraduate advising, portfolio advising, and department leadership roles), but will also consider service to the discipline outside of the university (e.g., service on NIH study sections, editorial boards for science journals). Significant department leadership roles (e.g., associate chair, directors of graduate or undergraduate programs) and college or university leadership and governance roles (e.g., service on the faculty senate) shall warrant assignment of a second unit of service. Unlike the research rating, which considers a three-year period of research reviews, the service rating may be adjusted year-to-year based on current and expected service levels. All full-time faculty are expected to substantively contribute at least one unit of service each academic year.

3. Distribution of Teaching Workload Units. A single unit of teaching is defined as four credit hours of work or equivalent. This could consist of a three-credit course plus substantive contributions to the teaching laboratory program and research mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students. Assessments of equivalence will be made by the workload evaluation committee, and ultimately determined by the chair.

WORKLOAD APPEAL

A faculty member wishing to appeal a workload assignment must file a written statement with the chair within two weeks of the original notification of the workload assignment. The chair and the school dean will consider the appeal on its merits and make the final determination as to whether a modified workload assignment is warranted. The chair and dean must respond within two weeks
following receipt of the appeal. When the matter is not resolved at the school level, further appeals will be directed to the dean of Bouvé College of Health Sciences for review.

SPECIAL CASE MODIFICATIONS OF WORKLOAD:

1. **Workload for new tenure-track faculty.** Newly hired tenure-track assistant professors will be assigned a “high research” rating for their first five years, with the commensurate teaching assignment. In the interest of helping with the acclimation of newly-hired tenure track faculty, teaching workload in the first year will be reduced by one unit (final assignment: four units of research; one unit of teaching [assignment to be determined by the two department chairs in the case of jointly-appointed faculty]; and one unit of service).

2. **Course buy-out.** In accordance with the April 13, 2018 BCHS Policy on Externally Funded Research, faculty members may reduce their teaching loads, so as to devote more time to research, if they have external grant funding to support a portion of their academic-year base salary. Regardless of the amount of funding secured, faculty cannot buy out of more than three courses per academic year. All faculty must teach a minimum of one course per academic year. Buy-out of service obligations is not allowed. Course buy-out rates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buy-out Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Academic-Year Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buy-out of 1 course</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy-out of 2 courses</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy-out of 3 courses</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Approved leaves.** Workload expectations for faculty who take family, medical or sabbatical leaves from the university will be adjusted by the chair based on time away and in accordance with prevailing university policies.

4. **Other considerations.** In assigning and evaluating faculty workload, consideration will be given to efforts in developing new courses and to large class sizes. A standard course in this workload policy refers to a four-semester hour (4 SH) course with 100% teaching and coordination. For team-taught courses or courses with credits greater or less than 4 SH, faculty will receive workload credit proportionate to their teaching efforts in the given course(s). Faculty serving as course coordinators for courses where teaching efforts are at least 30% for a given course will receive consideration for such efforts in their workload assignments and evaluations.

POSTING OF WORKLOADS AND WORKLOAD POLICY

In the interest of transparency, the workload policy and the workload of each faculty member will be posted on the departmental SharePoint or Blackboard sites, in terms of their research/teaching/service distribution.

REVIEW OF THE WORKLOAD POLICY

This policy will be reviewed one year after implementation. Thereafter, the policy will be reviewed at least every three years by the department as a whole, with specific feedback and suggestions offered by the workload evaluation committee. Additionally, the workload Evaluation committee may provide feedback to the chair and school of pharmacy’s executive committee for consideration at any time. The executive committee will review the recommendation to determine if a modification of the policy is warranted based on departmental needs or practices, after which
the recommendations will be advanced to the Office of the Dean in BCHS. The workload evaluation committee and department chair will also have shared responsibility of ensuring that the policy is being followed by the department.

JOINT APPOINTEES

1. **Workload.** The workload of a jointly appointed faculty (i.e., interdisciplinary faculty) will be commensurate with the faculty member's appointment percentage. For example, a faculty member whose appointment is 50% in the department of pharmaceutical sciences will be responsible for a total of three workload units as a member of the department, and the remaining workload units of work will be assigned by the department(s) holding the other portion(s) of the appointment. For example, a faculty member with a “high research” designation will have 1.5 units of research, one unit of teaching, and 0.5 units of service centered in the department of pharmaceutical sciences.

2. **Merit review.** The department will perform the merit review of jointly-appointed faculty as performed with all others. If the joint appointee’s primary appointment/tenure home resides in the department, then the department merit score will be directive of the faculty member’s merit raise, adjusted according to the merit score provided by the joint department. If the joint appointee’s primary department/tenure home is outside of the department of pharmaceutical sciences, the merit score will be provided to the chair of the joint department for consideration of merit according to that department’s policies.

3. **Coordination with Joint Department.** The chair of the department will be the conduit/liaison through which workload and merit review discussions are held between departments.

Note: This policy was adopted from the workload policy of the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology in the Northeastern University College of Science.
Checklist

For Unit Workload Policy Documents Each unit’s Chairperson or Dean should initial each point on the checklist. By doing so, he or she attests that the full time faculty workload policy document satisfies each of these requirements.

SLP Document consistent with published College and University policies.
SLP Document clearly reflects the goals/aspirations of the unit as these relate to workload.
SLP Document clearly defines the types of activities that constitute each of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities. And service for the unit.
SLP Document describes the different types of full-time positions in the unit.
SLP Document clearly defines the teaching, research and service expectations for the different types of appointments.
SLP Document describes all unit policies related to workload for full time faculty.
SLP Document describes in which workloads may be modified.
SLP Document states how frequently the workload policy document will be reviewed.
SLP Document indicates where and how the unit’s current workload policy document can be found.
SLP Document indicates where and how the workload assignments for each full time faculty member can be found.
SLP Document describes the process for faculty to address any concerns with their workload in the unit.
SLP Document indicates date of approval, any subsequent modifications by the unit, and anticipated date of next review.
SLP Document indicates when it was sent to the Provost’s Office to be included in the master list of policies for all units.

If the unit has one or more faculty with joint appointments in other units:

SLP Document defines how the workload policy changes for faculty members with an appointment of less than 100% in the unit, include impact of tenure home.
SLP Document describes how the unit will coordinate workload policy decisions with other units for faculty members with joint appointments, and how differences in workload expectations across units will be handled.

Approvals:

Policy modified: November 13, 2018
Policy approved by the department: November 14, 2018
Next department review date: October 2019
Policy approve by BCHS Dean: November 15, 2018
Policy sent to the Provost office:
Policy approved by the Provost: