

**Department of Spanish & Portuguese:  
Flexible Workload Policy  
Revised – June 12, 2006  
Approved – August 8, 2006**

Introduction:

This document proposes a three-year pilot of a more equitable and flexible workload policy. This policy values excellence in all aspects of the different roles of faculty members, namely research, teaching, and service. In a nutshell, we propose a plan for instituting variable teaching loads.

Under this plan, faculty members who are productive researchers and contribute significantly via service to the Department, the University, and/or the profession may have a 4-course per year teaching load. The “fifth course” of the “standard” teaching load of the University will consist of faculty contributions in the form of significant service and sustained research productivity. Faculty members may continue teaching 5 courses per year by requesting such an assignment, or they may be asked to do so by the chair, in consultation with the advisory committee, when they do not meet the significant service and sustained research productivity criteria. Any such arrangement will be considered temporary and reviewed on an annual basis.

The new workload plan is the result of careful analysis of enrollment patterns, teaching and service distributions over the last few years. In a College and University budgetary environment where fiscal responsibility is required, this document shows that the policy will be revenue neutral or better (see Enrollment analysis).

As expected of a comprehensive workload plan, this document is coordinated with our Pattern of Administration and Appointments, Promotion and Tenure documents, and particularly with the Faculty Duties & Teaching Load Policy section of the former (VI.D) and the Merit Salary Increases and other Rewards section of the latter (VI). The Workload Policy provides additional details to principles and criteria already outlined in those documents. It therefore refers to them but it also supersedes them in the specific points addressed by it.

The plan has been thoroughly discussed by the Department’s Advisory Committee and the faculty as a whole. It has broad consensus among the members of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, and the faculty commitment to make it work.

Rationale:

This policy better reflects the different ways in which colleagues contribute to the enhancement and reputation of the Department, in accordance to the principles outlined in the University's Academic Plan. By providing greater flexibility, the new policy will further contribute to our progress in the areas of academic excellence (in research and teaching), and fostering innovative outreach programs.

In addition, the new system will allow for a greater degree of equity among faculty members by a) acknowledging different types of contributions; b) rewarding all productive scholars with a course-reduction (and not only assistant professors and other faculty members with contractual or assigned reductions); and c) spreading the service load of Departmental administration more widely. Similarly, it will bring us in line with the standard teaching load (of 4 courses/year) among peer and benchmark institutions.

#### Implementation of the Plan:

In order to implement a Workload Plan that both achieves our goal of enhancing the quality and reputation of the Department and is fiscally responsible, we will take the following steps:

- 1) Reduce the number current administrative and honors advising (10), and journal editor (1) reductions from the current 11 (with the 5-course base) to 5 (with the 4-course base).
- 2) Maintain, at their current level of 4, the number of courses taught by assistant professors (5 faculty members) and those with contractual reductions (3 faculty members). Maintain, at their current level, the number of courses taught by the vice-chair and the directors of graduate and undergraduate studies (at 3 each), and of the chair (at 2).
- 3) Revise our current colloquia series and release some faculty members to teach 6 additional courses beyond the 4-course base.
- 4) While a non-teaching quarter may become more common, all faculty members, except those on FPLs, LOAs, or SRAs, will be on-duty three out of the four quarters of the year.
- 5) Maintain the SRAs as an exceptional category for a possible reduction from 4 to 3 courses per year (and off-duty status during the SRA quarter). An SRA may also be requested with the 4-course load to achieve off-duty status during a particular quarter and reduced service assignments during the other two quarters.
- 6) Assign more faculty members to teach higher enrollment courses (mostly English-taught GECs and selected 400 and 500 level courses).
- 7) Provide faculty supervision for the instruction of 400-level and GEC courses faculty are unable to teach given our small numbers.
- 8) Overloads from 2005-06 will be recognized in 2006-07 but should occur rarely (if at all) in the future.

These actions (particularly 1, 3, and 6) should enable us to make the Policy revenue neutral (see the Enrollment analysis, below). We would implement the following

additional adjustment during the next academic year (for Winter and/or Spring 07), or for the second and third years of the plan, if necessary:

- 9) Increase enrollments in a select number of courses.

In sum, we are committed to making all necessary adjustments to be able to implement the new policy and to make it work fiscally.

#### Process and Adjustments:

Faculty members will indicate whether they wish to be considered for the 4-course teaching load at the beginning of the scheduling process (in late Autumn, for the next AY). Those who meet the criteria of sustained research productivity and significant service contributions (see Criteria, below) should reasonably expect approval of such request.

The flexible teaching assignments (for the subsequent academic year) will be evaluated each year in the context of the annual reviews of all faculty members conducted during the Spring quarter. It is worth noting that according to our A, P & T document, the annual salary recommendations are made at the end of the review process by the chair, in consultation with an elected Advisory Committee, but that it also takes into account the input from the appropriate P&T committees and faculty bodies.

As noted above, faculty may continue teaching 5 courses per year by requesting such an assignment, or they may be asked to do so by the chair, in consultation with the advisory committee, when they do not meet the significant service and sustained research productivity criteria (see Criteria, below). In such cases, a faculty member will be asked to teach 5 or, exceptionally, 6 courses the following year. A colleague must be put on notice one year before any extra teaching assignment is made. This year is considered a “probationary” period. If the following annual review determines that in the most recent review period research productivity has become acceptable and significant service was provided, no additional teaching will be assigned.

“Teaching-enhanced” assignments (of more than 4 courses) are expected to be rare. Any such arrangement will be considered temporary and reviewed on an annual basis. Merit salary adjustments will take into account the variable workloads of faculty (see Salary adjustments, below). Assistant professors are not allowed to seek teaching enhanced arrangements, and Associate professors close to promotion are discouraged from doing so.

#### Criteria:

The criteria to determine what constitutes sustained research productivity and significant service come from our POA and A, P & T documents. Both documents stress the many

ways in which colleagues can meet such criteria and contribute to the mission of the Department; the fact that quality should be more important than quantity when assessing faculty research, teaching, and service; and that the contributions in these three areas should be judged as appropriated to rank (i.e., full professors are expected to have higher visibility and impact in the field, and assistant professors are expected to provide less service). In spite of the inherent complexities evaluating faculty research productivity and service, the Department regularly makes judgments on the quality and quantity of faculty contributions in the annual review and salary increases process. The Categories of Evaluation in the Merit Salary Increases section (VI.A.2) of the A, P & T document defines the criteria most succinctly:<sup>1</sup>

“The underlying principle guiding the determination of merit salary increases is to establish three categories of performance evaluation following the results of the individual faculty member’s annual review and his or her overall standing in the field: a) appropriate according to **regular** expectations, b) **superior** performance compared to the norm, and c) **inferior** performance compared to the norm. . . .

A “**regular**” performance in the year under review implies effective teaching results that demonstrate attention to, and improvement in, those areas, if any, that had previously been cited as needing betterment; **effective service as assigned; and a body of qualitatively good research, showing progress, development, innovation of analysis, and having documentable impact on the field.** . . .

A “**superior**” evaluation implies documentable excellence in at least one of the three areas, distinctly surpassing the “regular” level, while the other two remain at a “regular” level. An “**exceptional**” subcategory refers to truly outstanding performance in two or three of the component fields of activity (scholarly pursuits, instruction, and service).

The category of “**inferior**” obtains for a performance where one of the areas is clearly lacking compared to the “regular” level, and where there is no effective compensation in the other areas. The rare evaluation of “**deficient**” shall apply in cases where the faculty member has not submitted appropriate information for evaluation, or where two or three areas of activity have been judged to be “inferior” for the year evaluated” (emphasis added).

Under our Workload Policy, faculty members rated “regular” or above by the Chair in consultation with the Advisory Committee, in the context of the annual review and salary determination process, should expect a 4-course teaching load the following AY. Those rated “inferior” or “deficient” in the annual review process in the research or service categories (or overall) would be put on notice that they would receive an additional teaching assignment the next-to-the following AY unless their research productivity and service contributions are rated acceptable (i.e., “regular” or better) in the following review period.

Since service is assigned by the Chair, in consultation with the faculty members, “significant service” applies when a faculty member meets expectations on his/her

---

<sup>1</sup> Some colleagues do not like our current categories of “inferior (and deficient), regular, superior (and exceptional)” and they are likely to be changed when our documents undergo a next round of revisions. Without getting hung-up on the labels, it should be understood that we are basically dealing with three broad categories that could easily be considered as referring to performances that are below-, meet-, above/exceed- expectations, **as appropriate to rank.**

assigned service. Ratings below “regular” indicate that the service was not provided or was not effective. Service assignments vary a great deal. They normally include membership in one to three Departmental committees (graduate studies, undergraduate studies, language studies, P&T, search, etc) or assignments (honors advising, course coordination, area scheduling, and others). Service provided to the College, the University, and the profession is also acknowledged by the Department.

Research productivity also includes a wide array of potential contributions, as noted in our Pattern of Administration (Faculty Duties, Research, VI.D.2):

“Although **research results** are difficult to quantify, they **are typically communicated in the form of books, editions, translations, textbooks, articles in professional journals, chapters in books, etc., as well as technologically enhanced formats. An important indicator of the quality of published research is the professional reputation of a press, journal, or other dissemination channel, and its selectivity.** The value of each of these publication formats varies from area to area within the department and can not be quantified.

Beyond the publication of research findings, the department also values many research-related activities which are essential to a faculty member’s national and international standing. A partial listing of these activities includes: obtaining external grants and competitive awards; editing journals; refereeing manuscripts or proposals as members of editorial boards of journals, publishers, or granting agencies; presenting invited lectures and participating in scholarly meetings in the US and abroad, etc.”

Following our two governing documents, therefore, the criteria of “sustained research productivity” is met when faculty members can “demonstrate” that their publications and related research activities are of high quality and show “progress.” Colleagues who receive a “regular” rating in research for a given review period, typically would have published one or two substantial articles or book chapters, presented their work at scholarly meetings, and made progress on a major project (such as book manuscript or edited volumes). This example is not intended as a quantitative threshold nor does it begin to exhaust the different types of research contributions. It is included for illustration purposes only.

#### Salary adjustments:

A variable workload policy should adjust its merit salary increases to better acknowledge the different ways in which faculty members contribute to the mission of the Department. Accordingly, we propose the following percentage weighting for the basic increase, based on the variable annual teaching loads:

- 4 courses: 50% Research, 30% Teaching, 20% Service
- 5 courses: 40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service
- 6 courses: 30% Research, 50% Teaching, 20% Service

Faculty members who do not publish often and regularly may wish to play to their teaching strengths and choose to teach more than 4 courses in order to receive higher salary increases.

Enrollment analysis and supporting data:

The enrollment patterns of Spanish & Portuguese are different from those in other COH departments in the following ways:

- a) Like all Foreign Language departments (FL), our enrollment base is made-up to a large extent by the elementary and intermediate language courses (Spanish 101-104, 250; Portuguese 101-104, 501/502). This area of the program has experienced sustained growth (but we have minimal faculty instruction at this level).
- b) Unlike many COH departments (including some FL), we have not been particularly effective at capturing large numbers of students in non-language GEC courses or staffing a significant number of the GEC courses we teach with faculty instructors.
- c) Our number of majors and minors has been increasing at a faster rate than the College's averages, and our number of honors majors and minors now surpasses 100 in each category. Many of the 400-level courses for majors and minors (and some at the 500 and 600-level) have been taught by GTAs.
- d) We have three different, substantial, and healthy graduate programs with minimal overlap between them, as well as a growing Portuguese program. Students in Hispanic Linguistics and those in Literatures and Cultures (L&C) only share the teaching methodology course (Spa 801), and within L&C, those in Peninsular may have as little as one (at the MA-level) or two courses (at the PhD-level) in common with their counterparts in Latin American.

Our scheduling process first meets the needs of the graduate programs, then of the honors program, and finally those of the major and minor programs, beginning with senior seminars and other core courses at the 500 level. Given our limited faculty numbers, few 400-level courses and even fewer language and non-language GEC courses are taught by faculty (in 2005-06, 27 400-600 sections of courses for Spanish majors and minors were taught by GTAs). As a consequence of all this, our enrollments per faculty-taught course are relatively low (15 in 2004-05, 15.1 in 2005-06).

It seems clear that in order to maintain and increase the number of enrolled students in faculty-taught courses we need more faculty members. The two new senior lecturers hired for 2006-07 and the hiring of two assistant professors for autumn 2007 will allow us to make our workload policy revenue neutral and to maintain and increase enrollments in faculty-taught courses. The increases should certainly materialize if we also take into account faculty-supervised courses (including the 400-level and above and the non-language GECs and other interdisciplinary courses taught in English). (The administrative positions of faculty course coordinators for Spanish 401, 403, 404, 430, 450, and the GEC courses have been added to our faculty service assignments).

A careful analysis of our enrollment patterns over the last several years leads us to the following conclusions: 1) We should focus on the enrollment patterns of the last three years (without ignoring previous experiences). The fluidity of our offerings required by our growth (growth that has required a heavy faculty commitment in a larger number of honors and other courses for majors and minors -- 46 in 2005-06 vs. 38 in 2004-05) suggests that longer-term averages will provide less (rather than more) useful information. 2) In order to maintain or increase enrollments in faculty-taught courses, we need to assign more faculty members to teach our higher enrollment courses. These can be classified in the following categories:

- a) Non-language GEC courses, taught in English: Spanish 150, 151, 320, 321, 322, 330, 331, 380, 520, Portuguese 330 (and others to-be-developed);
- b) Selected 400-level courses: Spanish 401, 430, 450);
- c) Popular courses for the major: Spanish 560, 561, 580, 581
- d) Other courses taught in English: a new Spa 367, 506, 510, 640, H590 (and others to be developed)

The courses listed in d) have been developed recently (367, 640) or are require smaller groups (H590, 510) because of their honors status or study abroad component. Nevertheless, with the success of our new Spanish Minor for Business, we expect 506 (Latin American Business Context, in English) will grow enrollments and join the (a) group, just as 406 (Business Spanish) should join b). For the time being, however, these courses will not be included in the analysis of enrollment patters provided below.

**Enrollment Patterns: Spanish Courses, 2003-2006:**

# of students / # sections: and average # of students per section (# sections)

Course type	03-04	04-05	05-06	3 yr. ave.	last 2 yrs. ave (04-06)
<b>a) GECs</b>	<b>402/9</b>	<b>299/8</b>	<b>375/10</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>37.4</b>
<b>b) Sel. 400s</b>					<b>23.7</b>
401	134/6	191/8	181/7	24 (21)	24.8 (15)
430	60/4	55/2	91/3	22.9 (9)	29.2 (5)
450	140/6	135/7	154/7	21.5 (20)	20.6 (14)
<b>d) Popular 500s</b>					<b>26</b>
560	55/2	54/2	56/2	27.5 (6)	27.5 (4)
561	58/2	51/2	50/2	26.5 (6)	25.3 (4)
580	27/1	23/1	28/1	26 (3)	25.5 (2)
581	30/1	25/1	25/1	26.7 (3)	25 (2)

Looking at these figures, and considering our overall average # of students per faculty taught course in 2004-06 was 15.05, it is clear that to the extent our faculty are able to teach the type of courses listed above to a larger extent than in the past, our enrollments can easily be maintained or increased.

Under our current teaching arrangement (with a 5-course base), faculty members are teaching no more than 75/students per year on average (5 courses x 15 students/course = 75). The actual figure is lower since the average number of courses taught by faculty members per year over the last six years is 3.7 (3.7 over the last three AYs as well):  $3.7 \times 15.1 = 56$  students / FTE.

Under the proposed Workload Policy, with a 4-course base, more faculty members will be assigned, one GEC course (type “a”) or one high-enrollment courses (type “b” or “c”). As a consequence, they should be able to teach over 70-75 students per year:

3 “regular” courses @ 15 students = 45 + 1 GEC @ 35 students = 80 students; or  
3 “regular” courses @ 15 students = 45 + 1 Sel 400 or Pop 500 @ 25 = 70 students.

“Regular” courses refers here to the average combination of courses our faculty teach, which normally includes a graduate course (two in some cases), a senior seminar or an honors course, a less-popular 500 or 600-level course for the major, and possibly an advanced-language skills course with lower enrollments.

If the average number of courses taught by faculty (including FPLs, SRAs, and LOAs) remains at 3.7, or even if it drops to 3.6, the new course assignment outlined in this Workload Policy will allow us to teach more students per faculty member ( $3.6 / 4 \times 70 = 63$  students / FTE, or 13% more than under our current model).

The expected average increase in enrollments in faculty-taught courses will more than offset the smaller reduction in the number of faculty-taught sections for 2006-07, in comparison to 2005-06, see Appendix A).

The following comparison of the last two years illustrates how additional faculty personnel will permit targeted assignments, and how these will help with enrollments:

	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>Diff.</u>
FTE	24	26	2
Number of faculty-taught GECs	3*	5	2
Total Enrollments in these GECs	74	206	132
Total enrollments in all faculty-taught courses	1286	1498	212
Number of faculty-taught (F-T) courses	86	97	11
Average # of students / FTE	14.95	15.13	0.18

\* One of these sections was taught by an adjunct professor

Additional faculty members translated into more faculty-taught (F-T) higher-enrollment courses (GECs in particular), which in turn yielded a higher number of enrollments in GEC courses and in all the F-T courses: a 16% increase in the number of students enrolled in these courses.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Since Spanish & Portuguese has the lowest percentage of enrollments in F-T courses in the College, we welcome this trend.

While we can not guarantee exactly the same level of success, we can and we will determine the course assignments that attract more students in F-T courses: Since our enrollment history indicates that GEC courses (type “a”) enroll about 20 students more than our “regular” courses, and that the “Selected 400-s” and the “Popular 500s” (types “b” and “c”) about 10 more, we can reasonably estimate enrollment growth in F-T courses proportional to the additional faculty teaching these courses.

Appendix B shows that faculty members will be teaching seven GEC courses in 2006-07 (151, 321, P330, 322, P330, 380, and 520; as opposed to 5 in 2005-06, and only 3 the year before), an increase that it is made possible by the new senior lecturers being hired. We are also offering two more GEC sections overall than last year, and two more sections that will be taught by (new) senior lecturers. In sum, we have 6 additional F-T or faculty-supervised GEC sections. We expect these assignments will result in further increases in enrollments. Our enrollment history suggests we should have about 120 additional students in these 6 courses. This change by itself should more than cover the small loss in the total number of sections to be taught under the new Workload Policy. As mentioned earlier, however, we will also mind the higher-enrollment 400 and 500-level courses and, if needed, would increase enrollment caps in other courses.

As shown in Appendix A, the maximum teaching capacity under the new policy is only 7 courses lower than our current maximum. Since the current average class size in F-T courses is 15.1, the loss of 7 sections entails a potential loss of 105 students. As shown above, the additional GEC sections should bring-in 120 students beyond our current level. Thus, as long as our faculty and new senior lecturers are able to teach 6 more GECs than in 2005-06 and previous years, this Workload Policy should not impact enrollments in a negative way whatsoever. In fact, considering that the actual number of courses to be taught next academic year (2006-07) is only 2 below 2005-06, loss of enrollments is not a serious concern if our careful planning is followed and if we continue to monitor enrollments closely. Our Workload Policy, therefore, should not only work for 2006-07 but also in the foreseeable future. The new senior lecturers and future new faculty will actually allow us to increase our enrollments simply by following our current scheduling practices and being mindful of assigning, to the extent our faculty resources allow, one GEC or one higher-enrollment course for majors and minors to each faculty member.

#### Assessment:

At a broader level, the quality and reputation enhancements promised by this new policy will be assessed through the metrics used by the NRC surveys. More concretely, the quality indicators included in the Department’s annual reports will be used to measure these enhancements and increased research productivity in particular. This document will be our primary academic assessment (and self-assessment) tool for the new policy.

In the fiscal area, the Department is committed to ensuring that the new policy does not affect enrollments in a negative way, and will assess our success in this area by reviewing enrollment figures annually and monitoring them closely and continuously (to make adjustments, if necessary, even during each year). Since this is a faculty workload policy, we will focus on faculty-taught and faculty-supervised courses, including the GECs and 400-above courses for majors and minors. As always, we will continue monitoring overall enrollments as well. A 3-year baseline of enrollments on each of the sub-categories will be established for this assessment. Careful scheduling of faculty-taught courses will also be crucial as a planning and forecast strategy each Winter (for the following AY). These teaching schedules will be included in annual reports as well.

Appendices: Appendices A and B provide information of the teaching assignments and course reductions for the faculty for 2005-06 and a comparison for our proposal for 2006-07, with the new policy in effect.

Appendix A lists the course reductions and the number of faculty courses taught in 2005-06 and those scheduled for 2006-07 under the new policy, as detailed in Appendix B. Spanish & Portuguese faculty members taught 97 courses in 2005-06 (95 in SPPO), and are scheduled to teach 94 in 2006-07 (93 in SPPO). Our F-T course / FTE ration will remain practically unchanged.

(For perspective, it is worth mentioning that our faculty taught 72 courses in 2000-01, and 85, 85, 82, and 88 (04-05) in each of the following years. At 93, we will be within 2% of our highest level of F-T instruction).

In other words, under this Workload Policy we plan a reduction of only two faculty-taught courses for 2006-07. Controlling for a lower number of FPL, SRA, and LOA reductions, we are 6 courses short from the 2005-06 figure and 7 short in terms of the maximum net teaching capacity (after standard reductions). These figures are not too far apart because of the net savings of 14 course releases, and the 6 additional courses achieved through a revision of our professional colloquia. They will be even closer in the future, when overloads from previous years will be a rarity. (Given the high demand in advanced courses for the major, including senior seminars, we gave 4 faculty members overloads in 2005-06).