

Faculty Workload Policy Review Rubric

This rubric is to be used by deans to provide a qualitative evaluation of departmental workload policies. The evaluation should explicitly state whether the department's policy is approved, not approved, or provisionally approved pending revisions, and it should specify the areas where the policy is deficient and identify any revisions that are required.

1. Purpose, definitions, and structure

Does the policy provide a clear statement of purpose? Are terms clearly defined? Is the document organized effectively for the purposes of transparency and clarity?

Sample Indicators:

Is there a statement of purpose that reflects the purpose of the policy and reflects the general principles of the UTRGV Workload Policy? Does the document reference applicable UTRGV and UT System policies relevant to faculty workload? Are definitions provided for specific terms such that the document is easily understandable to all members of the unit faculty? Are the terms of the document organized into sections and subsections (if necessary) to ensure transparency and accessibility for all faculty members in the unit?

2. Transparency and shared governance

Evidence is provided of substantial and meaningful faculty participation in the development of the unit's workload policy.

Sample Indicators:

This could be documented by providing a description of the development process (including meetings, committee work, vote results, etc.), attaching meeting minutes to the policy document and so on.

3. Fairness and equity

Does the policy and the process to implement it adequately account for the richness and variety of faculty endeavors including teaching, scholarship and service so that all faculty can continue their personal and professional development without unduly burdening any category of faculty beyond what would normally be expected given their rank and type (e.g. tenured, tenure track and lecturers)?

Sample Indicators:

Are the weights assigned to different course types (e.g. lec, labs, seminars, large sections, etc.) adequate to their importance and prevalence in the unit? Does the department provide evidence supporting the differences between reference course sizes? Does the policy consider the need for alignment with faculty review considerations? Is its process to assign differential teaching loads clearly defined and aligned with the expectations associated with different faculty categories? Do the workload equivalencies seem sufficiently comprehensive, or stated in a general enough way, to account for most of the kinds of factors likely to impact faculty workload?

4. Faculty Assignment/Resource allocation

Does the policy and its implementation process allow Chairs the flexibility necessary to assign their units' resources in such a way that student success is maximized?

Sample Indicators:

Are reference courses defined so that they maximize opportunities to meet student needs while being aligned with disciplinary/pedagogical considerations? Does the policy make explicit reference to historical data and enrollment trends as well as strategic planning consideration as elements to establish seat capacity for the academic year?