

## IUB Policy Statement on Allocation of Faculty Time Including Clinical Faculty

At the request of the IUB Dean of Faculties Office, the Faculty Affairs Committee drafted a policy statement regarding the allocation of faculty time for IUB Education faculty. The committee members discussed this topic during the fall 2002 semester.

The 2002 discussion was based on the assumption that time should be discussed in terms of percent of time spent in the traditional areas teaching, research, and service. The decision was made to discuss percent of time rather than hours worked because some faculty may be more efficient in some areas than other faculty, making direct comparisons of hours spent on a particular task problematic. Also, issues related to total hours worked relate to faculty workload issues, not allocation of time. The committee also agreed to use “time” and “effort” interchangeably in order to simplify the discussion.

The committee recommends the following allocations:

	Teaching	Research and Creative Activity	Service
Tenure probationary faculty	40%	50%	10%
Tenured faculty	40%	40%	20%
Clinical faculty	40 – 60%	*	40 – 60%**

\* Research and Creative Activity should align with the scholarship noted in the promotion guidelines for clinical faculty.

\*\* Service commitments for clinical faculty are often extensive, long-term, reach beyond the campus, and are substantially different from those of tenure faculty. As per the POLICIES FOR LECTURER AND CLINICAL APPOINTMENTS <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/lecturerClinicalAppointments.pdf> , “In addition, in cases where major service duties significantly exceed unit average loads for student advising, curricular administration, and unit committee work, these should be accommodated by additional reduction in teaching loads.”

These allocations are an attempt to acknowledge that tenure probationary, tenured faculty, and clinical faculty face different expectations for how their time is allocated, with a reduced emphasis on service for tenure probationary faculty. A focus on teaching and service gives due regard to the contributions of clinical faculty and acknowledges the varying roles that clinical faculty assume.

The committee does not recommend setting separate expectations between the associate and full professor ranks. A variety of three-tiered systems were discussed, but committee members identified several problems with each three-tiered system that the two-tiered system largely avoids.

The committee recommends establishing 40% as the baseline for teaching effort rather than a more traditional 50% to reflect our status as a major research university.

The committee believes that a 12.5% buy-out per course is appropriate, but the committee also emphasizes that faculty may be involved in projects that require buy-out service time (i.e., some projects may require a substantial decrease in time devoted to service within one's program and or department).

### **Definitions**

The definitions of the three traditional categories of faculty activity can be found in the 2002 School of Education Promotion and Tenure Criteria (02.30R).

### **Expectations**

Expectations are that the 40% teaching represents a two course three credit hour load per semester, 60% teaching represents a three course three credit hour load per semester and – as noted below – 10% service for tenure probationary faculty represents service on one department or program committee and one school committee. Allocation of service for clinical faculty is determined in agreement with the department chair while taking into consideration program coordination, external agencies, and other academic administration duties. Given the considerable differences in standards for research and creative activity across the many fields represented in the School of Education, the committee does not recommend suggesting expectations for numbers of publications, conference presentations, and the numerous other activities that fall under this category (e.g., scholarship of research, teaching, and service).

### **Tenure Probationary Faculty**

The committee views 10% service for pre-tenure faculty as service on one department or program committee and one school committee, with limited responsibilities in both cases. The committee recommends that all service requests of pre-tenure faculty be discussed with the faculty member's mentor in consultation with the department chair to provide a buffer and allow requests beyond a 10% commitment to be turned down with a minimum of political discomfort.

At the same time, the 10% figure is not meant to send the message that service is not important. Indeed, participating actively in service allows a junior faculty member to network, learn about institutional history and campus culture, and participate directly in faculty governance. The intent of limiting tenure probationary faculty to 10% is to protect them from excessive service requests that will keep them from the teaching and

scholarship activities that will most probably form the basis of their tenure case. This policy addresses campus service. It is assumed that state, national, and international service is also important and it is expected that the tenure probationary faculty member would discuss such commitments with the department or program chair and mentor.

### **Modify These Baseline Expectations**

If a faculty member wishes to change his/her allocation of time, this should be discussed with the department chair prior to the start of a year under review. The proposed allocations should be viewed as a general guideline for more specific discussions of allocation of faculty effort between a faculty member and the department chair. Any modifications to these baseline percents should be agreed to by the chair and faculty member in writing. The modified allocation would serve as the basis for the annual merit review for that faculty member.

### **Tenure and Promotion Issues**

The allocation policy was crafted with the School's revised tenure and promotion guidelines in mind ([http://education.indiana.edu/docs/policy-council/11.53\\_Revised\\_FINAL.pdf](http://education.indiana.edu/docs/policy-council/11.53_Revised_FINAL.pdf)). The committee believes that the recommended allocations are a better fit for the revised guidelines than the traditional (and formally unstated) 50-25-25 assumption. If these baseline expectations are modified by the faculty member and department chair, these modifications should be considered when the faculty member is being considered for tenure or promotion. These expectations should be communicated by the individual's department chair, and in cases of tenure probationary faculty, also by the mentor(s).

A faculty member pursuing tenure or promotion on the basis of a balanced case may choose to increase the allocation of time to service. That decision should be made prior to the third year review. The committee emphasizes that the expectations for scholarship are similar regardless of whether the individual chooses to emphasize a particular strength or balanced case in her dossier.