

# Policy on Faculty Workload for Computer Science

December 7, 2022

In accordance with the university-wide Policy Workload Policy (effective June 1, 2021) as well as the SLU School of Science and Engineering (SSE) Faculty Workload Policy, this document articulates the principles, policies, and procedures that govern the faculty workload and evaluation within the Department of Computer Science.

## **1 Workload Distributions**

The university-wide Policy on Faculty Workload assigns 24 workload units for all faculty under a 9 month contract; any workload beyond this constitutes an overload, which must be approved by the provost and compensated accordingly. Within the Department of Computer Science, faculty members select the workload distribution that reflects their desired activity level in each area of



- Supervision of capstone projects
- Curriculum development/revision
- Program assessment
- Student recruitment
- Faculty recruitment
- Mentorship of junior faculty (by senior faculty)

As a general rule, these collective responsibilities must be shared amongst the faculty. As is the case with other aspects of workload, it is recognized that different faculty members may have different roles and responsibilities in service, that these roles naturally vary over a multiyear period, and that departmental service must be balanced with efforts to support related programs (e.g., mathematics, data science, or bioinformatics), the college, the university, the profession at large, and the community through professional outreach.

In general, one workload of service (out of 24) equates to about 1.6 hours per week over the 9 month appointment. Thus, a typical 3 unit allocation allows for the faculty to be spending almost 5 hours a week on regular service activities. As an example of this workload, a faculty member would gather course-level assessment for courses taught, serve on at least one significant department committee, serve as a faculty mentor to a typical share of majors/minors, and perform some professional service, on occasion, outside the department (either at the university or professional level).

Higher levels of service contribution (or displacement of some of the typical departmental service) might be achieved through participation in college- and university-level committees, or through service to the profession (e.g. as an organizer, program committee member, or steering committee member for professional meetings, as a reviewer or editor for publication, as a task force or advisory board member). In general, higher service workload levels such as these should be addressed on the annual review document as well as with the chair, so additional workload is approved and included in the faculty member's allocation of units. If changes occur during the course of the year, the faculty member should consult with the chair, although it may not always be possible to change the workload allocation on short notice for the coming year.

## 5 Representative Workload Distributions

To better illustrate a range of possible workload distributions, this section describes some typical faculty profiles. The ranges given are fairly typical for workload assignments in the CS department, but will be set for each individual faculty in a given year based on planned activities and recent performance, and hence may vary in individual cases.

Profile	Teaching	Research/Scholarship	Service
A	18{23 units	0 units	1{6 units
This is a profile of a faculty member with little to no research activity over the past 3 years, or who was primarily hired into a teaching-oriented position; while primary contributions are in teaching and service, continued professional development is expected, i.e. through participation in teaching development workshops or conferences.			
B	15{20 units	2{4 units	2{6 units
This is a profile of a faculty member with minimal research and scholarship, perhaps having one or two papers or presentations and no major grant activity over a 3-year period.			
C	12{15 units	4{8 units	2{6 units
This is the profile of a faculty member with moderate research activity, generally including three or more significant publications over a 3-year period, visibility at national or international meetings, and some form of grant expenditures.			
D	9{12 units	8{12 units	2{6 units
This is a profile of a faculty member with high research activity, typically demonstrated with above-average research productivity and consistent grant funding. Typical levels will include PI or co-PI on grants that cover at least one month of summer salary, as well as funding of one or more graduate students, and an average of at least 2 meaningful publications per year.			
E	6{9 units	12{18 units	1{4
This is a truly remarkable profile of a faculty member with outstanding national recognition, at least 3 significant publications per year, major project commitments, and grant funding that includes significant summer salary and academic-year salary buyout as well support for multiple graduate students.			

The above table contains only examples and thus does not represent a full range of possible workload distributions, and ranges are approximate in nature. Some faculty members may have distributions that fall in gaps between the above profiles. Given that teaching assignments are in essence discrete, assignments of teaching loads may take into consideration a multiyear window in order to achieve an approximate match to the desired teaching effort. Furthermore, the assignment of teaching loads for each year must, to some extent, depend upon Departmental needs.

In general, reliable data about expenditures is not available; in addition, yearly workload is set for the following academic year, but expenditure data by its nature is only historical even when available. Roughly speaking, Profile D above (e

two students, and some buyout, this would approximately equate

Rating	Teaching	Research <sup>1</sup>	Service <sup>2</sup>
1	not meeting basic teaching obligations	no recognizable research program	absence from department meetings, refusal to accept service assignments
2	weak evaluations and syllabi; little variety; no attempt to improve	ongoing program, but little or no output; no publications, grants, or submissions	minimal participation; unwillingness to work on department activities
3	mediocre evaluations and syllabi; minimal contribution to departmental efforts; some attempt to improve	lower than average output or quality; some evidence of submission of publications and/or grants	minimal service to U.D. and the profession, or some tradeoff between these
4	moderate evaluations, syllabi, and contributions, or a similar balance; some capstone supervision	about one-half publication of good quality per year; some effort for funding; some external recognition	basic service to both U.D. and the profession, or medium to one and minimal to the other
5	good evaluations, syllabi, and contributions, on balance; capstone supervision	about one publication of good quality per year; good funding efforts; moderate visibility of work	medium service to both U.D. and profession, or good to one and basic to the other
6	strong evaluations, syllabi, and contributions; capstone supervision	about one and a half publications of good quality per year; internal funding and/or good effort for external funds	good service to both U.D. and profession, or very good to one and medium to the other
7	excellent evaluations/syllabi; capstone supervision; one of curriculum level, innovative practices, indiv. supervision	two or more good publications per year; moderate funding; good visibility of work	very strong commitment to both U.D. and profession, or exceptional to one and medium to the other
8	excellent evaluations/syllabi; capstone supervision; two of curriculum level, innovative practices, indiv. supervision	prolific publication (more than two per year) with demonstratable impact; significant external funding	outstanding to both, or exceptional to one and good to the other
9	outstanding evaluations and contribution plus external recognition outside the department	clear international reputation; outstanding productivity; strong external funding	leadership positions at university, department, or profession, and very good service to others

<sup>1</sup>Given typical timeframe for research projects and for external evaluations of publications and proposals, annual evaluation of research should be based on a sliding window of the recent three years of activity.

<sup>2</sup>Use of phrase "U.D." in descriptions shorthand for University/Department