Workload Guidelines – Department of Dance and Theatre*

1. The Weighting of Teaching, Research, Service
The UNT Academic Workload Policy 06.027 states that, “Generally, it is expected that a tenure-system faculty member will carry a balanced workload, though in certain cases a major focus on scholarship, on instruction, or on service is warranted. Percentage workload weights in each area of teaching, scholarship, and service must be assigned to allow all tenure-system faculty members to fulfill their role as members of the community by engaging in and pursuing a meaningful program of research and creative activity.”

Each of the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative research, and service is weighted for evaluation purposes according to the individual faculty member’s distribution of effort as designated in the document entitled “Total Workload Report Form” (see Appendix A). Distributions of effort among DT faculty may vary depending on individual faculty assignments and circumstances.

For tenure-track faculty in the department, a balanced workload generally aligns with:
• 50% research
• 40% teaching (four courses per academic year, or 2 courses per semester)
• 10% service
This distribution is recognized as standard by the department, and distributions that favor teaching or service too highly may have a negative impact on the tenure and promotion process.

For tenured faculty in the department, a balanced workload is typically:
• 40% research
• 40% teaching (four courses per academic year, or 2 courses per semester)
• 20% service
As with the distribution of effort for tenure-track faculty, this distribution is recognized as standard by the department, and distributions that favor teaching or service too highly may have a negative impact on the promotion process to full professor.

For non-tenure system faculty (i.e., lecturers) in the department, the workload is focused primarily on teaching and is typically:
• 0% research
• 80% teaching (eight courses or 4 per semester)
• 20% service
Again, this distribution is recognized as standard by the department, and distributions that favor service too highly may have a negative impact on the promotion process.

For the department chair, the workload is focused on administration and aligns with the following:
• 50-70% administration
• 10-20% teaching (2 courses per academic year or 1 per semester)
• 10-20% research
• 10% service (outside of the department)
2. Assigning Workload/Performance Percentages

Policy 06.027 also states, “Workloads for individual faculty are assigned annually, to ensure that the unit meets its instructional responsibility while respecting the faculty member’s academic goals.” Pursuant to UNT policy, workloads for individual faculty are set by the department chair.

The process of determining workload assignments begins at the end of each academic year and is revised each spring semester immediately following the review of the previous year’s annual evaluation for each faculty member.

Workload agreements for an academic year can be reassessed after the conclusion of the annual review cycle in the prior academic year based on the Department’s PAC’s assessment of teaching/research/service productivity over the period of three years.

Faculty should bring any requests for changes in workload percentages to the chair for consideration.

The process of determining annual faculty workload assignments begins with appropriate assignments for teaching. For example, in a 40/40/20% split (Teaching/Research/Service), the 40% represents approximately two course instructions per semester. Directing, designing or serving as Artistic Director for the Faculty Dance Concert, Technical Director or as Managing Director of Theatre Production (in ways that significantly engage faculty members’ interaction in the department’s production season and for which the activity typically spans more than one semester) may replace one teaching assignment per academic year. Academic advisors (if faculty members) in dance and in theatre receive one-course reduction each academic year for the duration of their service.

For tenure-system faculty, acceptable or satisfactory levels of scholarly/creative productivity (activity score of no lower than “4”) are defined by the PAC evaluation guidelines and procedures (see Appendix B: Evaluation Standards). The research workload percentage will be reduced when an individual receives an assessment less than satisfactory (activity score of “3” or below) in the area of scholarly/creative research for two consecutive years.

Probationary tenure-track faculty members are encouraged to monitor their service expectations and to keep service activity within the department.

Depending on the emerging needs of the department and the faculty member’s productivity, the department chair may adjust teaching, research, and service loads after consulting with the faculty member.

Faculty members receive, in writing, the nature of weighting for their performance for the following calendar year in the form of a document entitled “Total Workload Report Form” (see Appendix A). Each faculty member signs the workload form, and it is submitted as a guiding document in the Department’s PAC’s annual evaluation process.
The workload percentage allocation is integral to the annual process for evaluation of faculty productivity through the Department’s PAC (Personnel Affairs Committee) and RPTC (Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee).

Basic examples of percentage allocations for teaching and service are presented below:

Teaching:
Each course taught equals 10% of the total workload.
Summer courses are treated as outside the employment contract.

Service:
While some service activity may be difficult to quantify in terms of time spent, the Department uses the following guidelines in setting expectations:
10% = 120 hours per academic year (4 hrs [10% of 40-hr workweek] x 15 wks x 2 semesters).
20% = 240 hours per academic year.
25% = 300 hours per academic year.
And so on.

Service activities may take place at various levels (department, college, university, professional community) and may range from committee service to other activities including, but not limited to, ad hoc committees (e.g., faculty search committee), faculty mentoring, student recruitment, organizing/contributing to departmental events, and sponsor of student clubs.

Appendix A: Total Workload Report Form

Name __________________________________________ Semester/Year _____
Department ________________________________

I. Instructional Activities
   Percent of time assigned to Teaching ______

II. Scholarly/Creative Research
    Percent of time assigned to Research ______

    Research on: ____________________________
                  ____________________________
                  ____________________________

III. Administration and/or Service
     Percent of time assigned to administration/service ______

IV. Total Percent of I, II, III ______

_____________________________________
Faculty Signature

Appendix B: Evaluation Standards

Descriptions of Activity Scores
The PAC will establish a numerical rating or activity score in each of the three areas (research, teaching, and service) for each individual faculty member. This rating or score is based on a numerical rating from 1-10, with “10” being the highest.

**Outstanding (9 to 10) - High**

General characteristics – high productivity with excellent results; very active, high achievement

Teaching: superior evaluations or evidence of superior classroom performance as judged by student and peer evaluations; evidence of student productivity

Research: highly productive research of superior quality as evidenced by excellent reviews of creative work; extramural grant funding; consistently high quality publications; invited presentations of national and/or international ranking

Service: superior service to Dept, College, University or community; outstanding professional ethicacy displayed toward meeting goals and mission of department and displayed in work with colleagues and enhancing a sense of teamwork

**Excellent (7 to 8) – Above Average**

General characteristics: above average productivity with good quality

Teaching: excellent classroom performance as judged by student and peer evaluations; evidence of student productivity

Research: consistently productive research of excellent quality; invited/adjudicated work of regional or state ranking

Service: very strong commitment to Department, College, University or Community; Obvious professional ethicacy displayed in work with colleagues and with sense of teamwork.

**Very Good/Satisfactory (4 to 6) – Medium/Average**

General characteristics: consistent productivity of good quality

Teaching: good student and peer evaluation, but clear indication of more attention needed to be given to teaching preparation and course development; student evaluations clearly mixed and course updating may be needed

Research: consistently productive research of quality, but more local presentations; few, if any, adjudicated reviews or reviews of mixed opinions of work

Service: good service to Department, College, University, or Community; clearly making attempts to work as a strong team member

**Needs Improvement (2 to 3) - Low**

General characteristics: minimal productivity
Teaching: fair student and peer evaluations, but more in the low range than mid-high evaluation range; clear signs of needed attention to course and syllabi development
Research: consistently lower than average efforts; few, if any, presentations with no adjudicated reviews of work; little effort made toward professional development, presentations or creative output
Service: fair to minimal service to Department, College, University, or Community; difficulty in working as a team member

Unsatisfactory (0 to 1)

General characteristics: substandard performance in most areas
Teaching: consistently poor student evaluation; two or more unsatisfactory peer reviews
Research: no recognizable attempt to produce creatively; publications have not been forthcoming; no efforts to make presentations on any level or be involved in professional activity
Service: essentially little to no service to Department, College, University or Community; difficulty in working toward team projects and meeting goals of group

Merit Categories
Category I: Outstanding (activity score of 9 to 10) – High
Category II: Excellent (activity score of above 7 to 8) – Above Average
Category III: Very Good/ Satisfactory (activity score of 4 to 6) – Medium/Average
Category IV: Needs Improvement (activity score of 2 to 3) – Low
Category V: Unsatisfactory (activity score of 0 to 1)